

THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. SELWYN, D.D., REDHILL RECTORY, HAVANT,
to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XIV

MAY, 1927

No. 83

EDITORIAL

THE PRAYER BOOK

By decisive majorities the Provincial Synods of Canterbury and York have now endorsed the new Prayer Book, and there is every reason to suppose that it will become law before the year is out. The assent of the House of Laity would seem assured, seeing that they have already agreed to the majority of its proposals: while Parliament is unlikely to forget that the Book is a reply to Letters of Business issued by the Crown. Despite real defects, we think it is to be accepted as closing a long period of uncertainty and indecision in the Church of England, and as a serious effort to weld into a new synthesis religious impulses and ideas which were becoming dangerously centrifugal. For it is indeed as a synthesis rather than as a *via media*, that the new book must be regarded; and the distinction is important. It is of the essence of a *via media* that it walks prudently between extremes; of a synthesis that it strives to reconcile them in something new. The problem of the Church to-day has not been how to stake out its claims as against Rome and Protestantism, but rather how to incorporate into its own life the devotional and intellectual harvests of the last century, in whatever fields they have been reaped. Some will think that good grain has been unwisely rejected, or bad grain carelessly admitted. The proof will be in the bread. Meanwhile we propose to contribute to these columns during the year a series of papers on different features of the new Book, with a view to assisting its interpretation; and we begin them this month with a discussion of the Prayer of Consecration.

THE NEW PRAYER OF CONSECRATION

No part of the Revision proposals has evoked so much surprise as the new Prayer of Consecration; and it must be regarded as still an open question how far this section of the Liturgy, in contrast to all the others, will win its way in the English Church. Among those who have been most interested in this feature of the Revision, the first reactions to the new Canon have undoubtedly been hesitating, if not definitely critical; and there have been good reasons for this. Members of the House of Clergy, for example, cannot forget that the Western form of Canon which they approved secured the assent of many Evangelicals, and that the Grey Book alternative was sent forward with it chiefly in order to avoid a dividing vote upon the subject. Further back still, the whole momentum of the demand for revision of the Canon has come from the Catholic movement, and its desire was for a development of the existing Prayer on English and Western lines. Among liturgical scholars, moreover, the balance of opinion has been strongly in favour of such a course. The following scholars have contributed articles or letters on the subject to the pages of *THEOLOGY*:—Mr. Cuthbert Atchley (August, 1921: Vol. III., No. 14), The Dean of Wells (February, 1924: Vol. VIII., No. 44), Dr. Brightman (July, 1924: Vol. IX., No. 49), the Rev. J. W. Tyrer (November, 1924, Vol. IX., No. 53). Of these, Mr. Atchley's article was a study of evidence, and concluded with the statement that "it is probable that the Logos-epiclesis is an earlier type than the Pneuma-epiclesis." The Dean of Wells's article was largely exegetical, and contained a powerful criticism of the oft-repeated statement that an invocation of the Holy Spirit was "primitive." Dr. Brightman joined issue with him on the exegetical point of the meaning of "epiclesis," but quite definitely dissociated himself from those who desired an invocation of the Holy Spirit after the words of Institution;* and Mr. Tyrer went further than Dr. Brightman and pleaded for an invocation in the 1549 place. Finally, it should be observed that, if the new Canon is really as Eastern in structure as some maintain, it involves a radical departure from all previous English usage and the maximum of disturbance to the piety of English worshippers. In other words,

* The practical purport of Dr. Brightman's letter has been so much misrepresented by supporters of the new Canon that his own words should be quoted, viz.—"Let me say at the outset that I so far agree with the Dean, that I am not concerned to advocate the introduction of an invocation into our rite, unless it be in the position it occupies in the Mass of 1549" (*THEOLOGY*, IX., 49, p. 33).

equity, scholarship, and pastoral wisdom would seem to have conspired in favour of a different solution.

The Bishops, however, who cannot have been unaware of all these considerations, have decided otherwise, and have secured the assent of the clergy in Convocation to their proposals; and the new Canon is thus commended to us by weighty authority. We propose, therefore, to swallow our own disappointment and try to state as candidly as possible what seem to us both its virtues and its difficulties. It is quite possible that on important points our interpretation may be mistaken, and we shall wish to be free to revise it, if necessary, in the light of experience. We confess to being actuated by two desires—first, the desire to conserve the devotion which has always been centred for English Churchmen in our Lord's words of Institution, and secondly to have a full Catholic Consecration Prayer in the English Prayer Book; and of these two desires, the first is the strongest. At the same time, a certain detachment is made possible by the fact that the new Prayer is optional. The dignified and beautiful rendering of the English Mass, with its marked moments of exaltation or wonder or abasement, its symbolism of light and colour, its simple and expressive rhythm—all this, which has been one of the glories of the Catholic revival, remains. The question is whether the new Prayer can be accepted as a development of this. And on the whole we think that it can.

In seeking to appreciate any Prayer of Consecration we find ourselves bound to distinguish in it three elements.

There is first the element of Eucharistic doctrine proper, pregnant with the Church's belief as to what the Sacrament means. Secondly, the Prayer involves and expresses some conception of Consecration itself, which runs up into beliefs as to the nature of God and His methods of action in the rite. And, thirdly, there is the element of form or rhythm, which is concerned with the structure of the Prayer and its capacity for expressing the worshippers' emotional response to the divine activity. These three elements are so closely interwoven in the Prayer itself that no analysis can claim to be complete. Nevertheless, the distinction is real, and is useful so far as it goes, just as the knowledge of the constituents of a chemical compound is essential to the understanding of the compound itself. We will consider these three elements in the order indicated.

(1) Doctrine. From a doctrinal standpoint, there is no doubt that the new Canon is more full, more explicitly Catholic, and more thorough than the old. Not that there is any "change of doctrine"; but the teachings which lay latent in the old Canon

are now brought to light and openly expressed. This is particularly so with regard to the doctrines of the Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Real Presence. The Anamnesis, for example, makes it plain that the memorial is made before God, while the inclusion of the "Prayer of Oblation" in the Canon gathers into the one action the complex meanings and impulses of Christian sacrifice. Yet again, the Invocation, whatever we may think of its place and its form, is unequivocal in its witness to the objective aspect of Consecration, which carries with it the truth of the Real Presence.

(2) When we turn, however, from Eucharistic doctrine proper to the question of the conception of consecration implied, we are on much more debatable ground; and it is difficult to speak with confidence. Certain facts, however, are of importance. In the first place, the form of invocation adopted in the new Canon is understood to be due particularly to the insistence of the Evangelical group among the Bishops. This would appear to suggest that what they most wish to guard against is not the objective significance of the Consecration, but the notion that Consecration is effected by the recitation of a formula rather than by the action of God. While Catholics, that is to say, wished to draw out the truths of the Sacrifice and the Presence, Evangelicals aimed at expressing—what, indeed, Catholic theology has always taught—the equally important truth that the whole action is governed by the ever-living spirit of God. In that case, the Prayer represents a real attempt at positive synthesis.

But what are we to say of the way in which it finds expression? This issue has been obscured, in our judgment, by much which has been written in defence of the Canon. We venture to urge that it is an overstatement to say that the Prayer is "Eastern" in type. In contrast to the Eastern *epiclesis*, which is a full-voiced petition to the Father to send the Holy Spirit upon the elements, what we have here is rather simply an *allusion* to the Holy Spirit as co-operating* with the Father in the whole action of consecration and communion. Once more, the use of the phrase "thy holy gifts" in the Anamnesis, before the invocation is reached, at least suggests that we are not to think of the invocation as what it is in the East, a formula of consecration: the elements are already, in some sort, consecrated. We find ourselves moving, in short, to a conception of consecration at once more primitive and more profound than the Eastern.

It is the conception found in the Alexandrian liturgy, and reproduced in 1549—to wit, that consecration is a divine action

* The words "*with* Thy holy Spirit," rather than "through" or "by," are apparently due to this thought, and almost require this interpretation.

effected by the Three Persons of the Blessed Trinity, Father, Word, and Spirit.* The whole prayer is addressed to the Father; the words of Institution are those of the Word Incarnate Himself, speaking through His ministers; the invocation associates the Holy Ghost with the wondrous work; while, finally, all these activities, separable only for human thought, are gathered into one in the doxology at the close of the Prayer.†

If this be the case, then it must be avowed that the conception of consecration involved is lofty, ample, and satisfying. It does not change, but enriches, the conception underlying the old Prayer. Christ's words have still their ancient power, as consecrating words: He is still thought of as the unseen Consecrator. But He lives and acts in His Church in the power and by the presence of the Spirit. This conception, moreover, is as much Western as Eastern; we find so thoroughly Latin a divine as Paschasius Radbert, for instance, saying that consecration "is effected, not by the merit of the consecrator, but by the word of the Creator and the power of the Holy Ghost." Again, the whole Canon draws out the truth, attested no less clearly though differently in the Roman Canon, that consecration is not an act but an action, not a moment but a process. In this action and process there are moments of special tension, and chief of these remains the recital of the words of Jesus‡ marked as they are by the "manual acts." But the rhythm is not cut short there: it passes out again from that moment of august and awful harmony, and moves up into yet more heavenly places, borne on the hands of our great High Priest or lifted on the wings of the Life-giving Spirit; until at last it comes to perfect rest in the Triune Being of God.

(3) Form or Rhythm. This will probably be the point of chief difficulty in the adoption of the new Canon. The Church's prayers are to its faith what a nation's songs are to its soul, its closest and most intimate expression; and of no prayer is this so true as of the Prayer of Consecration. Apart from minor not very happy features, the new Canon involves two marked changes of rhythm. The first is the transposition of the Prayer of Humble Access to the Preparation, making the Preface and *Sanctus* the introduction to the Prayer of Consecration. The passage in the old rite from praise to penitence and back

* Dr. Armitage Robinson has a valuable discussion of the second-century doctrine of the Son and the Spirit as "the Hands of God" in his edition of St. Irenæus' *The Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching* (S.P.C.K., 1920), which is very germane to this point.

† Perhaps the most primitive form of invocation (cf. THEOLOGY, VIII., 44, p. 92).

‡ However early the *epiclesis* may be, it cannot be pretended that it is primitive in the same sense as the words of our Lord, which are recorded by the Synoptists and St. Paul, and described in the Johannine discourse as "spirit and life."

again to the great confession of faith with which the Consecration Prayer opens was often felt to be too abrupt, though many of us did not find it so: but there is no doubt that this change was generally desired. The second alteration is more far-reaching. In the old rite the prayer of invocation (Hear us, we beseech thee, etc.), which is the Church's response to the opening ascription, gives a natural and welcome release to the emotions, and bathes the whole solemn action which follows in the atmosphere of petition.* By transferring the invocation to a later point in the Canon, the new Prayer thus sacrifices a very precious feature of the old, and leaves it without anything corresponding at this point to the beautiful *Hanc igitur* and *Quam oblationem* of the Roman rite. The result is greatly to increase the tension in the early part of the Prayer, and to overcharge it with fact at the expense of feeling.

It is, of course, possible that the rhythm of the prayer as a whole contains balancing features which will reveal themselves in actual use; and indeed only use can put us in a position to reach any final estimate of the Prayer's liturgical form. And this brings us to a practical recommendation which we wish to urge. It is that the new Canon should be used with great caution by the clergy, and that priests should make and take every opportunity of conferring with one another as to their experience of it. It is not the ardent enthusiasts either for it or against it who will say the last word, but the rank and file of Catholic-minded clergy who accept it on authority and seek to find the truth and virtue of it. We do not think that it will ever oust the old Canon, because there will always be occasions—as, for example, at a Eucharist where children are present—where the shorter and simple form of 1662 will be the more suitable. The question rather is whether the new will take rank beside that, or not. If it does, then in this the central section of the liturgy, as in the other sections, we shall have the option of a longer or a shorter use. If it does not, then sooner or later the Church will have to set to work again.

* We do not agree that the absence of any petition before the words of institution deprives them of all consecratory significance: that is to insist too straitly on the chronological sequence. The inclusion of these words in the formula of reconsecration tells the other way. And it is to be observed that in the Roman Canon the consecrated gifts are not called Christ's body and blood until the end of the *Supplices Te*.

CONFERENCE OF GERMAN AND ENGLISH
THEOLOGIANs

FOREWORD

THE papers printed in this issue of *THEOLOGY* were prepared in advance for a conference of six English and six German theologians held at the Deanery, Canterbury, April 2-9. This conference had its origin in the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work held at Stockholm in 1925. Thus it provided an opportunity for that close personal meeting and discussion which Stockholm recommended between scholars of different Christian communions and nations meeting in different countries. But it was also connected with Stockholm in another way. In the Universal Christian Conference the questions were questions of "practical Christianity": yet behind those questions, in many minds, lay the deeper theological problem of the nature of the Kingdom of God and its relation to human society. This was the special problem which the twelve theologians discussed. And it is right to say that the setting of the problem, as well as help in other ways, came, fitly enough, from Professor Adolf Deissmann of Berlin, the chairman of the Stockholm Permanent Commission on Co-operation between Theological Teachers. Those present were Professor Paul Althaus, D.Theol. (Erlangen), Professor C. H. Dodd (Mansfield College, Oxford), Professor Heinrich Frick, D.Theol. (Giessen), the Rev. Sir Edwyn Hoskyns, Bart. (Cambridge), Professor Gerhard Kittel, D.Theol. (Tübingen), the Rev. J. K. Mozley, D.D. (Reading), Mr. J. H. Oldham (London), the Rev. A. E. J. Rawlinson, D.D. (Oxford), the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, D.D. (Editor, *THEOLOGY*), Professor K. L. Schmidt, D.Theol. (Jena), Professor W. Stählin, D.Theol. (Münster), Professor W. Vollrath, Lic. Theol. (Erlangen), with myself as chairman.

The papers themselves were limited to about 1,000 words each; and though the limit had to be passed in a few cases, all the papers are inevitably compressed. They led to very friendly and fruitful discussion, and on many points of importance scholars of different traditions found themselves at one. It is impossible to reproduce the discussion, but none who took part are likely to forget its vigour or its reality. And every one of the members is the richer for the experience of a week spent so happily together.

G. K. A. BELL.

P.S.—Below are published two letters which were addressed to the Conference.

LAMBETH PALACE, S.E.,
March 31st, 1927.

MY DEAR DEAN,

You will know how very deeply I am interested in the gathering you are about to hold at Canterbury for theological discussion. Nothing could be better than that picked men from Germany and from England should be meeting in the way suggested, and under your Presidency I have no doubt at all that the discussions will be of the highest value. Would that it were possible for me to be present and to hear some of them. That I fear cannot be, but I ask you to assure both the English and the German scholars who are thus gathered that I am with you in spirit, and that I pray with all my heart for the blessing of God upon your deliberations and their outcome.

I am,

Yours very truly,

(Signed) RANDALL CANTUAR.

THE VERY REV.
THE DEAN OF CANTERBURY.

Letter (dated March 28th, 1927) from Professor Deissmann addressed to all those who are taking part in the British-German theological week at Canterbury:

BERLIN,
March 28th, 1927.

At the commencement of your conference I feel bound to send to you all a word of heartfelt greeting. The conference, made possible by the kind hospitality of the Dean of Canterbury, is a direct outcome of the Stockholm Movement, and the subject you are to discuss, the Kingdom of God, raises a problem of vital importance at the present moment, a problem which, whether formulated at Stockholm or not, occupied a central position in the great religious conversations of the Churches. I expect great results to follow from the brotherly interchange of opinions between British and German professional theologians. My analysis of the situation leads me to the judgment that there is not, as so many hold, an irreconcilable opposition between "the" German and "the" Anglo-Saxon conceptions of the Kingdom of God. The situation is rather that the many-sided character of the Kingdom is united in the various Christian Churches in a parallelogram of œcumenical powers, in a Christian activism, which is not Pelagian in the sense of beating the drum of our own power, but recognizes that it is driven in Pauline fashion by the Grace of God in Christ Jesus.

It is my especial desire that the question should be raised

as to the extent to which the Dominion of God influences the affairs of this age.

In the masterly novel of Conrad Ferdinand Mayer entitled *The Saint* there occurs the following dialogue between the King and St. Thomas of Canterbury:

"To whom do you appeal, Thomas," laughed the King, "to the Holy Trinity?"

"I appeal to the Gospels," whispered Thomas, "which are the record of Him in whom there was found no unrighteousness."

"These are the words of no true Bishop!" cried the King in noble disgust. "These are the words of a wretched heretic! The sacred Book of the Gospels belongs to a pearl-embroidered altar hanging, and has nothing to do with the order of the world or with things as they really are."

The great Swiss poet has formulated the great problem, in a classical manner, and I make no secret of the fact that personally I do not accept the point of view of King Henry, but that of the Martyr Primate, and with the Stockholm "message to the Christian world" hold firmly to the primacy of the Christian ethos. I would bid you deal with this problem.

With the wish that your proceedings may go forward with great profit, I remain bound to you as a brother,

Yours affectionately,

(Signed) ADOLF DEISSMANN,

Chairman of the Theological Commission of the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work.

THE OTHER-WORLDLY KINGDOM OF GOD IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

IN a conference of theologians it is manifestly unnecessary to insist upon the importance of eschatological language in the earliest existing tradition of the life of Jesus, and in the Pauline epistles. The eschatology being central, the problem is to discover its significance in Primitive Christianity, and to discuss its relevance or irrelevance for modern Christian faith and practice. With the second of these problems this paper is not concerned. We are concerned at the moment only with the significance of eschatological beliefs and of eschatological terminology during the period of Christian history for which the New Testament provides documentary evidence.

In the course of the third chapter of his second epistle to the Corinthians, St. Paul develops a characteristic argument for the superiority of Christianity to Judaism, based upon a midrasch on the LXX version of the record of the inauguration of the Law in the Book of Exodus. He points out that the Old Law was written upon two stone tables, that the Jews never obeyed it, that, consequently, they were all unrighteous—clearly, patently, obviously unrighteous; and that Jewish history was a history of continuous disobedience. Of course, argues St. Paul, if you read the old narrative, the cause of this inadequacy is revealed. Moses was compelled to cover his face with a veil when he spoke to the people, both because they could not bear to see the glory of God face to face, and because even the glory given to Moses was but fleeting and temporary; the illumination grew dimmer and dimmer. He covered his face lest the people might perceive the disappearing glory. Then St. Paul's argument leaps to its conclusion. So it is with all knowledge of God outside the Christian ecclesia, and apart from conversion. His glory is unseen, unapproachable, dim and disappearing. A veil lies on the hearts of men, they have no certain knowledge of God or access to Him. His commands are written with ink or on tables of stone, and are therefore at best externally imposed. Knowledge is consequently incomplete and righteousness imperfect.

This vigorous criticism of Judaism, and by implication of paganism, is not the product of a dreamy idealism, for St. Paul is not contrasting the Jewish religion with a religion of the future or with a world of his own imaginings. His language is quite clear and precise. Judaism has been both fulfilled and superseded by a concrete faith and experience, a religion of flesh and blood. What had been previously written in ink on stone tables is now indelibly inscribed upon the fleshly hearts of men and women. What had been previously but a fleeting transient vision of the glory of God is now true and permanent knowledge perceived in the face of Christ Jesus, who is the image or concretion of God in flesh and blood. Whenever men turn to Him the veil of ignorance is torn from their hearts, and they have access to God, and proceed from glory to glory. The long desired salvation is therefore available, and, moreover, knowledge is actually productive of righteousness. The faithful converts are righteous men, they have passed from death to life, they are the holy people of God, saints, blameless—in fact, as St. Paul finally concludes, they are the New Creation. The whole realm of the action and energy of the Spirit of God is the new order, the new age, and the New Covenant. Hence there emerge the contrasts in which St. Paul rejoices, Letter—Spirit,

Death—Life, Darkness—Light, Sin—Righteousness, Law—Grace.

Many passages in St. Paul's epistles are no doubt lyrical, but they are written in praise of what is staggeringly real and concrete to him. Nor is there a particle of evidence to show that he is merely singing a rhapsody on the peculiar theme of his own mystical experience. His conversion is primarily but one illustration among many of the advent of the new order, and of the second creation. Christianity is therefore to St. Paul the great creative act of the mercy of God, and conversion is entrance into the heavenly, supernatural order, now descended and descending upon earth. The faithful Christians, filled with the power of the Spirit, are here and now being transformed so as to be like the Son of God, and the ecclesia is the concretion in a living organism of the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost.

Now comes the point. What is emerging from all this, emerging before our eyes as we read this section of St. Paul's epistle and many other similar passages in his letters, emerging without the writer being altogether conscious of what he is doing? He is engaged in transferring eschatological imagery in order to describe a present and concrete experience. The stars do not fall, nor do the mountains crumble away; the sun still shines, and the stars continue to twinkle. The physical structure of the universe remains, but the dream of that righteousness and peace and holiness which belonged hitherto to the eschatological hope has become a veritable concrete reality, since the Christians stand within the new order of the Spirit. The two worlds of the Flesh and of the Spirit, of this world and of the world beyond, remain no longer two periods of history, but are merged in one mystical ethical living whole. The glory of God is thus discovered displayed less in some expected catastrophic contortion of the physical world than in the simplicity and purity of the most humble Christian convert. To St. Paul this is the greatest of all the miraculous and creative acts of the living God.

That Christianity was primarily a possession, and only consequently and secondarily a hope, was more clearly understood by the two authors who gave Christianity literary form at the end of the first or at the beginning of the second century. It is characteristic of the Johannine writings and of what is peculiarly Lukan in the third Gospel and in the Acts of the Apostles that the expectation of the end of the world has fallen almost completely into the background. This is not because the eschatology is an awkward element in Christian tradition, which they decide to set on one side, but because both authors

are confident that they are able both to understand and to interpret it.

In a very important passage at the beginning of Acts St. Luke surveys the past history of the Christian Religion, and draws the attention of his readers to its significance. With a wealth of symbolism, which is in part obvious and in part only subtly suggestive, he records the foundation of the ecclesia, and singles out the gift of the Spirit to the Apostles as the birthday of the Church. Then follows Luke's interpretation of the miracle, and it is surely a most amazing passage. He goes out of his way to unearth the most crudely eschatological passage from the Book of Joel. "In the last days," saith God, "I will pour forth of my Spirit upon all flesh . . . and I will shew wonders in the heaven above, and signs on the earth beneath, the sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood." That is Joel. St. Luke then comments that the gift of the Spirit to the Apostles was the fulfilment of the Joel citation. In other words, the coming of the Spirit is the true eschatology, the end, the new order of God, and, consequently, he means his readers to understand, since Pentecost all true converts stand within the kingdom of God.

The Johannine writings, it is hardly necessary to point out in this company, express the same conviction. Christianity is eternal life here and now, baptism and conversion involve rebirth from above and entrance into the kingdom of God. Christian sacrificial worship is the true and spiritual worship of God, spiritual not in spite of the Word becoming flesh or of the consequent eating of the Flesh and drinking of the Blood of the Son of God, but in very truth because of this. Christian knowledge is the knowledge of God, and Christians are not merely believers and knowers, but even seers. He who has seen the Christ and accepted Him has actually seen the Father. The eschatological sayings of Jesus, which in the earlier Gospels appeared to contemplate the end of the world, are thus in the Johannine writings, simply and apparently consciously, transformed into prophecies of the coming of the Spirit which was to follow the death and resurrection of the Son of God.

This transformation was the great triumph of primitive Christian thought, and emerged as a result of reflection upon the traditional words of Jesus in the light of Christian faith and experience. Christianity was thereby transformed from a small company of men and women who expected the end of the world to be imminent into the Catholic Religion of men and women who had found God, and entered into the sphere of righteousness and truth. With the composition of the Lukan and Johannine writings Christianity may be said to have found

its feet, and the writers were in a position to contemplate a future history, though in fact they never actually do so.

The question may be raised at this point whether the Pauline—Lukan—Johannine interpretation of our Lord's teaching was really justifiable. Was the triumph of Christian reflection a triumph at the expense of His plain teaching? If once it be granted that His teaching and actions were throughout mainly symbolical, the eschatological language may also be treated as imagery adequate to express His conviction that the advent of the kingdom would not merely follow, but would be inaugurated by His death. To speak humanly He knew Himself to be standing on the brink of a new spiritual order, which would fulfil the longings of the greatest of the Hebrew prophets. The traditional eschatological imagery provided Him with a vehicle to express the significance of His life and death. If this be regarded as in any way a probable view, the Johannine writings may well be treated as the first completely satisfactory interpretation of His teaching.

Thus far an attempt has been made to show that the ecclesia, considered as Faith, Joy, and Love as an organism, was perceived by the most intelligent Christians at the end of the first century to be the fulfilment of the eschatological hope—to be, that is, other-worldly. The kingdom of God had descended upon earth, and was realized, concreted, in a living organism of flesh and blood. But this does not wholly do justice to the eschatological language. There is a considerable overplus with which we must now deal.

A learned and pious professor of divinity has recently defined the immediate task of Christian theologians to be the re-expression of Christian faith in terms of evolution. But to those who regard the beliefs of the primitive Christians as in any degree normative for Christian theology it would appear that the task of the Christian theologian is rather to preserve the Christian conception of God from the corrupting influence of the dogma of evolution, at least as that dogma is commonly understood.

Our New Testament is almost entirely controlled by the thought of God as active and powerful, and the writers show no tendency to regard His activity as an activity within the sphere of a developing history, or as the energy which gives movement and life to the physical structure of the Universe. The action of God is consistently regarded as catastrophic. He works miracles, He transforms men into saints. Prayer is an effective appeal to Him to act, thanksgiving is the expression of gratitude to Him for having acted miraculously. The delight in the record of physical miracles was primarily

the pleasure in finding an adequate and pregnant method of describing the nature of the God who had revealed Himself catastrophically and miraculously. They symbolized the nature of the God whom the primitive Christians worshipped. There is no single instance in the New Testament of mere delight in physical miracles as such. God had miraculously transformed weak, ignorant, sinful men into the kingdom of His love and mercy. Each conversion was a miracle, and it was this which gave peculiar content to the so-called nature miracles, and to the dramatic miracles of healing which formed so important an element in Christian tradition. For the expression of this vigorous conception of God the eschatological imagery was entirely adequate. It expressed and preserved the picture of God, which was the mainspring of primitive Christian faith, by transferring to the macrocosm of the physical universe what had been experienced in the microcosm of the individual and of the Church. God, who had transformed the lives of His people, must also be powerful to transform the physical universe that it might be free from the law of death and decay, and might perfectly express His will. The primitive Christian picture of God thus rested on the twin foundations of the experience of conversion and eschatological belief; the latter being the more primitive.

Important as the eschatology was for the conception of God as powerful and other-worldly, it was equally important for the ethical ideas and demands which form the background of the New Testament. The conviction that the structure of the world and of society was temporary and incomplete, and that it awaited some great catastrophic act of divine transformation, gave a peculiar and poignant direction to primitive Christian morality. Dissatisfaction has often been voiced that the New Testament contains no explicit teaching concerning War and Peace, or the duties of citizenship, or the laws of property, or the care of money, or the status of slaves, or the upbringing and education of children. Not one of the moral problems with which we are commonly busied is even mentioned in the New Testament with any genuine sympathy. Only by an unnatural exegesis can modern commentators give answers to the busy moral questionings of our social reformers. To the primitive Christians such problems were all completely secondary. What would survive the complete destruction of the present order, when they would stand naked before God, was their one fundamental ethical consideration. The eschatological belief crudely and ruthlessly swept away all secondary moral business, and stripped the primitive Christians, in idea at least, of all worldly possessions and all worldly entanglements. As a result of

the eschatology the ultimate moral duties stood out in all their luminous simplicity—love of God and charity to all who were similarly to be bereft of that in which they had so confidently trusted. This is not interim ethic, this is ultimate ethics, and ultimate ethics were born of eschatological faith. Only when this ultimate morality had been revealed and understood could the Church proceed to deal directly with the vast realm of secondary moral problems.

The eschatological imagery was, therefore, fundamental to primitive Christianity because it adequately guarded and preserved the other-worldly character of God, of the Church, and of Christian morality.

EDWYN C. HOSKYNs
(Cambridge).

THE OTHER-WORLDLY KINGDOM OF GOD IN OUR LORD'S TEACHING

THE Christians speak of the kingdom of God referring to the preaching of Jesus. We who live in the twentieth century are not the first who strive after the right understanding of the problem given by the kingdom of God. This expression has gone through the Christian centuries, and is still standing in the centre of dogmatic and ethical discussions. This fact means enrichment, but also a problem for anyone who desires to understand the meaning and the claim of Jesus' preaching. If we turn to Jesus' words themselves, we make the discovery that Jesus was not the first to speak of the kingdom of God. His preaching does not mean: I tell you that there is a kingdom of God, and that this kingdom has a certain aspect; but it means: I tell you that the kingdom of God is at hand. Thus Jesus speaks of a matter known to His listeners, His Jewish contemporaries.

If we want to make this case clear for us, the best thing to do is to speak of the word which indicates the matter. More than in other cases, we do well to take our starting-point from a lexicographical explanation.

The word which is used in the Gospel and which we usually translate by "kingdom" is βασιλεία, and, strictly speaking, indicates first of all the being, the essence, the position of the king. Since this matter deals with a king, we had better speak of his dignity and power. As a matter of course a second signification is introduced: The dignity of the king is represented in the territory governed by him, in his kingdom.¹

A look through the canonical Old Testament (Hebrew text and LXX), through the pseudepigrapha and apocrypha, and through the rabbinical literature shows that the meaning of "dignity," "power" stands in the foreground. In the New Testament, too, this fundamental meaning is decisive.²

Chiefly we have to deal with an eschatological conception which goes back to the prophets and is further developed by the apocalyptists, for which the expressions βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ and βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν are used. Anyhow, the second expression has its special colour in the fact that there is to be spoken of the sovereignty which comes from heaven into the world. It is this expression "kingdom of heaven" which gives us two important conceptions. Again it becomes clear that the essential meaning is not "kingdom" but "rule."³ And in this connection we understand that such a sovereignty from heaven in its nature cannot represent a kingdom which can be established by a natural development of worldly circumstances or by human exertions, but only by the interference of God from heaven.

The aspect of the kingdom of God, the character of the state where God rules, is defined negatively and positively by Jesus. Negatively taken, the kingdom of God is a thing opposed to all that is present and earthly, in short, something absolutely miraculous. Positively taken, the kingdom of God is defined by certain events which form the eschatological drama of the Jewish apocalypses. Nevertheless, Jesus does not undertake to describe clearly the last events and to indicate exactly their tokens. Here He does not out-bid his contemporaries, but stays far behind them. And furthermore, while in the Jewish eschatology the fate of the Jewish nation is more or less in the foreground, Jesus rejects all that has to do with politics. Here also he remains behind his contemporaries.

The negative sense is not to be understood as if Jesus had considered the kingdom of God as a chief ethical good, that men ought to realize by their conduct. By his rejection of the apocalyptic art of calculating we cannot draw the conclusion that He preaches immanence at the expense of transcendence.

The *tertium comparationis* of the parables of the sower and the seed growing secretly is only that the kingdom of God is certain to come without our assistance, just as the fruit ripens without the aid of the sower. The kingdom of God is beyond all ethics, a cosmical catastrophe, which is caused by God. He who puts all the emphasis on the ethics thinks consequently of the single individual. But Jesus does not put under His promise the individual, but only the congregation. The individual is only able to gain salvation as a member of the congregation.

One does not understand Jesus' preaching of the kingdom of God, if one overlooks the contrast between Jesus and Judaism. But one understands it still less, if one interprets this contrast along the lines of Greek thought. The Greek thought which always directs our way of thinking perceives in man a developing character, in which the bodily-sensual part gradually dies, and the spiritual-psychical part continually grows. At the same time we cannot replace individualism by universalism. This ideal of humanity is alien to Jesus, although it is so well known to late antique philosophy. He who sees Jesus in this connection only sublimates His preaching of the kingdom of God; thus he puts in the place of human apocalyptical fancy and of human political desires only a more refined humanity. Yet where God speaks and acts, no leading of the soul, no mysticism, no ecstasy can open the entry.

These fine human possibilities of contact with God, as the Greeks know them, are made impossible by the coarser Jewish pictures of heaven and hell. Anthropomorphic conceptions rather than a spiritualized philosophy leave God untouched in His other-worldly majesty. But I have to add also that the expressions which I have used and affirmed (other-worldly, transcendence, cosmical catastrophe, miracle) become at once inadequate, if we try to build a higher world with them.

The negative sense that the kingdom of God is nothing else but a miracle, must be kept in its absolute negativity. This negativity, that the kingdom of God is the entirely different, the absolutely other-worldly thing, is the most positive side of the character of God.

The realization of this reign of God lies in the future. And this future directs mankind in its presence. The calling for repentance, the calling for conversion, the command to turn away from the world, is meant for the person whom Jesus sets face to face with God and his rule. Where the man obeys this call, there he obtains contact with the kingdom of God, which comes without his own human assistance; there the Gospel becomes for him glad tidings.

KARL LUDWIG SCHMIDT

(Jena).

NOTES.

¹ The Greek lexicographer Suidas has expressed this in a very good way: τὸ ἀξίωμα καὶ τὸ ἔθνος βασιλευόμενον.

² Compare here the important article *Βασιλεία* in Hermann Cremer's *Biblisch - Theologisches Wörterbuch des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, II. Aufl. herausgegeben von Julius Kögel, Stuttgart, Gotha, 1923. Further: Erwin Preuschen—Walter Bauer, *Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, Giessen, 1925 ff. For the

Hebrew (and Aramaic) language מְלֻכּוּת (מְלֻכּוּתָא) and מְלֻכּוּת שְׁמִיָּה (מְלֻכּוּתָא דְּשְׁמִיָּה) compare Hermann L. Strack und Paul Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, Bd. I., S. 172 ff., München, 1922.

³ A. E. J. Rawlinson, *The Gospel according to St. Mark* (London, 1925), interprets God's Rule or Sovereignty, The Reign of God; Adolf Deissmann, *The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul* (London, 1923), Kingdom or Sovereignty, kingly rule of God. J. Warschauer, *The Historical Life of Christ* (London, 1922), p. 6: "What we translate 'the kingdom of God' meant thus rather His kingship, His reign rather than His realm. . . ."

THE THIS-WORLDLY KINGDOM OF GOD IN OUR LORD'S TEACHING

1. IN Jewish thought of the first century, as attested by apocalypses, by the earliest parts of the *Qaddish* and *Shemoneh-esre*, and by citations from Rabbis of the period, the *Malkuth* of God has two aspects: (a) It is the moral and spiritual sovereignty of God, accepted by Israel, or by individual Israelites and proselytes, in their submission to "the yoke of Torah." As such it is "this-worldly" in the sense that it is realized empirically in and through obedience to precepts of the Torah in daily life. (b) It is ideally the universal rule of God, now veiled or implicit, but to be "revealed" or made explicit in the Good Time Coming. This "revelation" of the *Malkuth* of God is variously thought of. On the one hand it is conceived in political terms (as in *Shemoneh-esre*) as the restoration of Jewish independence and sovereignty under historical conditions—as "this-worldly," therefore. On the other hand, it is conceived as purely transcendent, realized in a new order, after heaven and earth have passed away, or have been completely transformed.

2. In the teaching of Jesus the former aspect of the kingdom of God appears in such sayings as that about "receiving the kingdom of God as a child." It is, as in the Rabbis, the moral and spiritual sovereignty of God, realized, however, not through scrupulous observance of the Torah, but through a "childlike" attitude to God. Jesus certainly, not less than contemporary teachers, held that it is possible to realize God's sovereignty empirically in individual daily life here and now. His ethical teaching tells us how.

3. Where the kingdom of God is referred to the future, the affinity of the teaching of Jesus is with the transcendental rather than with the political type of Jewish hope. The national-political aspect is wholly absent. Nor does it appear that the

Consummation is represented as involving the triumph of a Messianic people over the worldly empires under earthly conditions. The Twelve Thrones of the disciples are hardly thought of as set up on this earth, and the new Temple which is to arise after the destruction of Herod's belongs to a new world, just as the wine which Jesus is to drink "in the kingdom of God" is *καινόν*, of a new sort. (Mark's *ἀχειροποίητον*, possibly borrowed from Pauline vocabulary, suggests the true interpretation.)

4. The fact that the kingdom of God is transcendent does not carry with it, as in the apocalypses, a denial of all value in the present world-order. There is, for instance, nothing in the Gospels parallel with the devaluation of this world in 2 Baruch lxxxiii.-lxxxv. On the contrary, Jesus expressly recognizes the working of God's sovereign will in the peaceable processes of nature and in the common life of men. The parables throughout imply an affectionate interest in the life of this world, which is quite inconsistent with such a world-denying attitude as that of pseudo-Baruch. (They are not allegories, making arbitrary use of figures borrowed from ordinary experience in an artificial symbolism, but true pictures of life as it is, challenging the hearer to find God there.) This is consistent with the well-attested fact that Jesus was notoriously no ascetic. Thus in His teaching the fact that the kingdom of God in its consummation is "other-worldly" does not exclude a real and recognizable reign of God in the world of nature and of man here and now.

5. The statement "*ἔφθασεν ἔφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ*" means quite unequivocally that the future has become present—"the kingdom of God has arrived" (*φθάνειν* in LXX = *naga'*, in Theod. of Daniel = *mṭa*). This surely means more than that it is now (as always) possible for any individual or group to accept God as King and loyally carry out His will. It means that the kingdom of God, in some sense in which it has hitherto been a future object of hope, is now present. (Has *ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ* a similar meaning? *ἐγγίζειν* also translates *naga'* and *mṭa*, and is the word used by LXX of Daniel where Theod. uses *φθάνειν*.) The most obvious clue to the meaning is the condition attached in Mt. xii. 28 = Lk. xi. 20: "If I by the finger (Spirit) of God cast out demons, then the kingdom of God has arrived" (cf. Mt. xi. 4-6 = Lk. vii. 22-23). That is, Jesus finds in the healing and restoring powers released in His own ministry a real coming of the kingdom of God. These powers, however, He does not regard as in any sense magical, or exerted upon men from without. "Thy *faith* hath saved thee." Faith is an attitude to God. In bringing, therefore, to men a new attitude to God, Jesus has brought new divine powers into play, and therein the kingdom of God has

come among men. Thus we are to find the kingdom of God in beneficent energies released through human faith for the enhancement of life here and now.

6. The parables of growth represent the kingdom of God as being in process of coming under historical conditions (for growth is a property of this order of space and time). The implied Old Testament references in the parable of the Mustard Seed (to the tree of Nebuchadnezzar's empire in Daniel and the cedar-tree of Israel in Ezekiel) suggest that the life of a society is in view; and the common application of the proverb "A little leaven leavens the lump" (twice in Paul) also suggests the thought of a community. The use, however, of the term "The kingdom of Heaven" as the equivalent of the empirical Christian Church in the First Gospel (*e.g.*, Mt. v. 19, xiii. 41, xvi. 19 ?) is not only out of line with any known pre-Christian use of the phrase, but is without parallel in our other Gospel documents. It is probably a late development. Thus we are not to interpret the parables of growth directly as though they pictured the growth of the Church. They speak rather of the kingdom of God either as a *process* working itself out through a community, or as a *principle* creating a community through which it obtains increasing power in the world of men.

The important point, however, is that instead of the abrupt contrast between this age and the next which meets us in Apocalyptic—a contrast so complete that only a catastrophic abolition of this order and the substitution of a supernatural order can "reveal the sovereignty of God"—we have the idea of a progressive revelation of the kingdom of God within this historical order. The process, however, is not finished within this order. When it has reached a certain maturity, τότε ὁ θερισμός—and the harvest is not here. Life passes to a higher plane.

C. H. DODD

(Oxford).

THE THIS-WORLDLY KINGDOM OF GOD IN OUR LORD'S TEACHING

1. TOGETHER with the hope of a supernatural kingdom of God (son of Man in the Book of Daniel), Judaism knows the hope of an earthly kingdom of God in the coming kingdom of David. This hope corresponds to a this-worldly need which is mainly politico-economic (Ps. Sol., 17, 21 *f.*; *Shemone esre*, bes. 14; Cant. r. on 2, 13). Yet is this expectation of the political kingdom on earth never merely the hope of an immanent

development, but of an inrush of the "other time" and the "other world" into this time and this world—that is to say, the act of God, who out of this world makes His world. The redemption of Israel and Jerusalem in its exact meaning is "God's consolation" (cf. Luke ii. 25, 38). However, that fulfilling of the law and steadfastness of endurance can help to bring to pass the day of the Lord is not thereby excluded by Judaism (syr. Bar., 44, 7: "If ye abide steadfastly in His worship and forget not His commandment, then shall salvation appear unto you and ye shall see the consolation of Israel"). But the decisive and lasting emphasis for all this hope—anyway for those among His contemporaries who heard the call of Jesus—is on the faithful and patient waiting and praying for the coming of the kingdom (Luke ii. 25, 38; Mark xv. 43). (Ps. Sol., 17, 21 f.; *Shemone esre.*)

2. The Beatitudes show how thoroughly Jesus depoliticized this expectation (Mark xii. 17; xi. 1-11; John vi. 15), but for the rest took up again its basic ideas: those who shall share in the kingdom of Heaven (Matt. v. 3) or in the consolation (Matt. v. 4) are those who, in the sense of Ps. xxxvii. 11, *κληρονομήσουσιν τὴν γῆν* (Matt. v. 5). But for them likewise is put away all possibility of the idea not only that they could of their own doing constrain the kingdom to come to pass, but also any belief that a man may have a part in it by virtue of his own fulfilment (of the Law) and of his own accomplishment: they are the *πτωχοί* (v. 3, cf. Matt. xi. 5; cf. further Luke xviii. 14), the *πεινῶντες τὴν δικαιοσύνην*. Their accomplishment (*ἐλεήμονες*, v. 7) is not the presupposition, but the effect, of the gift of God (cf. Matt. xviii. 21-35; Luke xix. 1-8). The kingdom which breaks into time and into the world is in every respect the act of God and nothing else.

3. This depoliticized kingdom, not evolved and not brought to pass, but breaking in upon the world, Jesus knows to have come through His presence *into* time and *into* the world: Luke xvii. 21; Matt. xii. 28 (expressed by St. John: *σὰρξ ἐγένετο*, John i. 14). In Him has the *ἐξουσία* of the other Aeon "appeared" (*ἐφανερώθη*): cf. Mark ii. 10; Matt. v. 22, 28, etc. The presence in time and in the world of the kingdom in Himself is the presence of the "other" world, is eschatology in the present. The parallelism in the Gospels of Parousia-language and of words implying the consciousness of actuality of *αὐτοβασίλεια* (Luke iv. 21: *σήμερον*; Matt. xi. 5; cf. also Mark ii. 20, *νύμφιος*) signify, once for all, the parallelism of an eschatology operative in time and beyond time.

4. In the handing-down of the sayings of Jesus, wherever a space of time is indicated, be it short or long (cf. *χρονίζειν*,

Matt. xxv. 5; Luke xii. 45), between the historical appearance of Jesus and the Parousia—for example, in the parables of the seed and the harvest—there, in most instances, a growth and ripening *in* time is spoken of—that is to say, a development within the world (Matt. xiii. and elsewhere). But (a) parallel with this development goes a development and maturing of the other kingdom, hostile to God (Matt. xiii. 25 *f.*); (b) the development of both is completed *beyond* time, not of themselves, but through the eschatological judgment of God breaking in (Matt. xiii. 28-30, 47-50), and not, therefore, through the superior action of the “Good,” working itself out with time; (c) no act or work of man assists in this development, but it is the act of God alone (Mark iv. 27).

5. Matt. v. 19, xviii. 4, show that Jesus knows of a “kingdom of God disposition” and of a “kingdom of God conduct” within this temporal order. In the same way, Matt. v. 3 *ff.* and v. 21-48 belong most closely together. Jesus’ demand for complete purity and love is the demand of the kingdom of God (*cf.* John xiii. 34: the *ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν* from Matt. v. is the *ἐντολὴ καινὴ*). That this demand faces any disciple of Jesus as the one absolute demand from God (Matt. v. 48), and that he must wrestle for it in a world which remains as long as it exists (Matt. v. 18, *ἕως ἂν παρέλθῃ αἰὼν οὗτος* and the battle-field of both kingdoms [*cf.* above, 4 (a) and (b)] occasions all tension in the life of the individual and of the nation. So, though every prayer of the disciple of Jesus shall be irradiated by the *ὅτι σοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία*, at the same time the *ἀφ’ ἑστέα τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν* and the *ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ* are as little likely to grow silent upon his lips as the ardent prayer for the eschatological in-breaking of the *αἰὼν μέλλων*, of God’s time and God’s world: *ἐλθάτω ἡ βασιλεία σου*.

G. KITTEL

(Tübingen).

THE KINGDOM OF GOD IN THE APOSTOLIC AGE

THE kingdom or sovereignty of God, in so far as in Apostolic times it was proclaimed as a religious message, and became the basis of a Gospel, was connected in men’s minds, not primarily with the idea of the kingship of God over Israel, or over the world, in this present evil Age: it was bound up with the ideas of the Coming Age, and of the future felicity of the saints. What was implied by the idea of the kingdom of

God was in effect the vindication *de facto* of that sovereignty over the universe which belonged *de jure* to God, but which in the present Age might be regarded as having been more or less successfully challenged by evil powers, who in the world as it now is had, to some extent, succeeded in establishing a temporary control. In the Coming Age God would finally vindicate His sovereignty, and all evil would be brought to an end. The "stone . . . cut out without hands" in the end would destroy the "great image," and the "God of Heaven" would Himself "set up a kingdom," which should "never be destroyed" (Dan. ii. 34, 44).

In the "kingdom," moreover, thus established by God, the "saints of the Most High" are to be given a share: the time shall come when "the saints of the Most High shall receive the kingdom, and possess the kingdom for ever, even for ever and ever" (Dan. vii. 18). The phrase "kingdom of God," therefore, though it denotes primarily the vindication by God of His Sovereignty, could be used to denote also, by metonymy, the *blessings* of the divine kingdom, the future felicity of the saints. The vindication and victory of God is the victory and triumph also of His saints. A state of things having been established in which everything that is evil is done away, the saints who, in this present Age, must endure tribulation* shall at length receive their reward, and in a world in which "there shall be no curse any more" they "shall reign for ever and ever" in the kingdom of their Father (Rev. xxii. 3-5). To "receive" or to "enter" the kingdom means, therefore, to enter into "life"—i.e., life everlasting, eternal life in the kingdom hereafter (cf. Mk. ix. 43-47). Thus the "mystery of the kingdom of God" (Mk. iv. 11) is essentially the "mystery" of Christianity—that secret purpose of God which (having now been revealed) is a secret no longer; the *open* secret of Christian salvation. Our Lord was held to have set forth the "mystery" of the kingdom in parables†—i.e., by the time that the Gospels were written the parables of Jesus were regarded as being obscure and as requiring a clue. The parables in general were regarded as referring to the kingdom, as intended to illustrate various aspects of the kingdom and of what was involved in it. About the kingdom—which was the reward of the saints—as about its coming, there remained still some elements of mystery; eye had not seen, nor ear heard, neither had it entered

* Cf. Acts xiv. 22: "Through many tribulations we must enter into the Kingdom of God."

† Lk. viii. 10 has the plural *μυστήρια*, and so also the *textus receptus* of Mt. xiii. 11. But Streeter notes that the singular *μυστήριον* (as in Mk. iv. 11) is read also in Matthew by *k c*, *a ff*², *Syr. S.* and *C.*, *Clem. Iren.* (Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, p. 313).

into the heart of man to conceive the things which God had prepared for them that love Him (1 Cor. ii. 9). Nevertheless, the "little flock" did not "fear," inasmuch as they were assured that it was "their Father's good pleasure to give them the kingdom" (Lk. xii. 32).

The kingdom of God, therefore, in the thought of the Apostolic age, is an object not primarily of present possession, but of future hope. It denotes essentially the coming sovereignty of God, in which the faithful are destined in some sense to have share. St. Paul can write to the Christian ἐκκλησία at Thessalonica as to those whom God is calling "unto his own kingdom and glory" (1 Thess. ii. 12); he can exult in the news of their heroic faith and endurance of persecution, because of his confidence that it means that in the end they will be "counted worthy of the kingdom of God," for which they at present are suffering (2 Thess. i. 5).^{*} How essentially "eschatological" and "supernatural" is the Pauline conception of the kingdom is made evident by the brusque statement that "flesh and blood" (i.e., human nature in its present condition) "cannot inherit the kingdom of God;" a remark which forms part of an argument to the effect that all Christians, with a view to entry into the kingdom, must either first die and be raised from the dead in a new "spiritual" body, or else must be miraculously "changed" or transformed without passing through death (1 Cor. xv. 50 *sqq.*). Meanwhile the possession of the Spirit is a kind of instalment or "earnest" of the future inheritance;† for the Spirit, manifested in power, belongs, strictly speaking, to the Coming Age rather than to this—the pouring out of the Spirit is a mark of the "last times" (Joel ii. 28; Acts ii. 17), and the φανέρωσις of the Spirit in the manifold χαρίσματα bestowed upon the Church is an indication that what the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews describes as the "powers of the Coming Age" (Heb. vi. 5) are already at work. It is thus also that our Lord in the Gospels is represented as arguing from the fact of the exorcism of demons in the power of the Spirit to the imminence of the kingdom—the casting out of demons by the Spirit, or (in the Lukan phrase) by the "finger"‡ of God, means that the kingdom of God, in a certain sense, has already arrived;

* The Thessalonians are said actually to suffer "on behalf of" or "for the sake of" the kingdom of God (ὕπὲρ ἧς καὶ πάσχετε), presumably because it is on the ground of their devotion to Christ and to the hope of the coming kingdom of God that they are at present undergoing persecution.

† 2 Cor. i. 22, v. 5 (τὸν ἀρραβῶνα τοῦ πνεύματος); Eph. i. 14 (τῷ πνεύματι τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τῷ ἁγίῳ, ὃ ἐστὶν ἀρραβὼν τῆς κληρονομίας ἡμῶν). Cf. Rom. viii. 23 (τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ πνεύματος ἔχοντες). For Christians as the "heirs" of the kingdom cf. further Jas. ii. 5.

‡ Ἐν δακτύλῳ θεοῦ (Lk. xi. 20) as a paraphrase for ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ is based on the LXX of Ex. viii. 19; cf. also Ex. xxxi. 18.

it is present and operative, as it were by anticipation,* in that which has just happened: there has been a manifestation of supernatural power, Satan's kingdom is tottering, the kingdom of God is already beginning to be unmistakably at work. What is here significant is the association of the idea or conception of the kingdom of God with the idea of the manifestation of divine, beneficent, and unmistakably supernatural power. So in 1 Cor. iv. 19 *sq.*, when St. Paul, writing of a proposed visit to Corinth, in which he intends to "know not the word of them which are puffed up, but the power," adds significantly "for the kingdom of God is not in word, but in power," what appears to be involved is that St. Paul, coming amongst the Corinthians, not with the eloquence of words but in the supernatural power of the Spirit, will be vindicated thereby as a genuine Apostle of the kingdom of God.

That the preaching of Christianity in Apostolic times could be described as a proclamation of "good news about the kingdom of God," as well as "about the name of Jesus Christ," is clear from the evidence of the Acts.† It is intelligible, therefore, that St. Paul should describe as "fellow-workers unto the kingdom of God" those who had been his companions in missionary labour (Col. iv. 11). Meanwhile, as regards entry into the kingdom, despite the fact that all Christians, as such, are among those who have been "invited" or "called" (for they are κλητοί as well as ἅγιοι—Rom. i. 7), the repeated warning is given that the unrighteous, and those guilty of various flagrant forms of sin, shall *not* "inherit" the kingdom (1 Cor. vi. 9 *sqq.*; Gal. v. 21; Eph. v. 5); and though the kingdom is compared in the N.T. to a banquet, at which Jesus would drink a new wine with His disciples,‡ the metaphor is probably not meant to be understood literally—it is a well-understood principle that the blessings of the kingdom are spiritual, and that its essence is "not eating and drinking, but righteousness, and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit" (Rom. xiv. 17).

Closely connected with the idea of the coming kingdom of God, and yet distinguished from it, is the idea of the present

* ἐφθασεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς (Mt. xii. 28; Lk. xi. 20). It is not improbable that the difficult ἐφθασεν may here represent a translation of the same Aramaic expression which in Mk. i. 15 and parallels is rendered ἤγγικεν. Cf. also Lk. x. 9, 11.

† εὐαγγελιζομένων περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (Acts viii. 12); cf. Acts xix. 8 (πείθων περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ), xx. 25 (κηρύσσων τὴν βασιλείαν), xxviii. 23 (διαμαρτυρούμενος τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ), xxviii. 31 (κηρύσσων τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ διδάσκων τὰ περὶ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ). For similar phraseology in the Gospel according to St. Luke cf. Lk. iv. 43; viii. 1; ix. 2, 11, 60; xvi. 16.

‡ Mk. xiv. 25. For the "banquet" metaphor cf. also Mt. viii. 11 (=Lk. xiii. 29); Lk. xiv. 15 *sqq.*; Lk. xxii. 18, 30, and for Jewish antecedents of the conception cf. Eth. En. lxii. 14; 2 Baruch xxix. 5 *sqq.*; 2 Esdras vi. 51 *sq.*, Pirke Aboth iii. 20.

or future kingdom of the Messiah. In the Synoptic Gospels the kingdom of Jesus (as the Messiah or the "Son of Man") is essentially *future* from the point of view of the life of Jesus upon earth—the Father has appointed for Jesus a kingdom hereafter (Lk. xxii. 29). So also in the Fourth Gospel the kingdom of Jesus is οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου (Jn. xviii. 36). In Mt. xvi. 28 the Son of Man comes in His kingdom at the *Parousia*; and "the Son of Man coming in His kingdom" is apparently regarded by the Evangelist as being the equivalent of the coming of the kingdom of God in power (so Mk. ix. 1, of which Mt. xvi. 28 is a paraphrase). On the other hand, in Mt. xiii. 37 *sqq.*, the "world" (or "field") in which the good seed is sown by the Son of Man is apparently already regarded as His "kingdom," since it is out of His kingdom that "all things that cause stumbling, and they that do iniquity," are to be "gathered" at the Judgment (Mt. xiii. 41). Speaking generally, the view of the earliest Christianity appears to have been to the effect that our Lord was enthroned as King (*i.e.*, as "Messiah" and "Lord") in the heavenly sphere as the result of His resurrection and exaltation to God's "right hand."* Henceforward the disciples (as I have elsewhere expressed it) were "convinced that the decisive step with a view to the bringing in of the kingdom of God had been taken. The end was not yet, but already the Lord Christ was enthroned; and the investiture of the Christ with His heavenly sovereignty betokened already the beginning of the end, the decisive hour in the great world-drama of redemption."† For St. Paul the exalted Christ is already reigning, and destined to reign; and Christians belong to His kingdom—they have been "delivered" by God "out of the power of darkness," and "translated" into "the kingdom of the Son of His love" (Col. i. 13). But the kingdom of Christ is as yet incomplete—there are "enemies" still to be subdued, of which "the last enemy that shall be abolished is death" (1 Cor. xv. 26);‡ and the final stage, according to the thought of St. Paul, will not be the kingdom of Christ at all, but the kingdom of God: "Then cometh the end, when He shall deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father . . . that God may be all in all" (1 Cor. xv. 24, 28). With this idea may be contrasted the reference in 2 Peter i. 11, to the "eternal kingdom (αἰώνιον βασιλείαν) of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ."§

* Acts ii. 33 *sqq.*

† *The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ*, p. 33 *sq.*

‡ Cf. the somewhat similar argument of Heb. ii. 5-15.

§ In 2 Tim. iv. 1 the Kingdom of Christ is connected with the idea of His "epiphany" with a view to the judgment of quick and dead; and in 2 Tim. iv. 18 we have "The Lord" (*i.e.*, Christ) "will deliver me from every evil work, and will save me unto His heavenly kingdom" (εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐπουράνιον).

A. E. J. RAWLINSON
(Oxford).

THE IDEA OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD IN THE ANCIENT CHURCH AND IN THE MIDDLE AGES

FOR Christianity in the post-apostolic age the creative forces are the Word of the Lord and the lives of His believers. There exists a union in the spirit and through the bond of brotherly love. Baptism in the Name of Jesus is common to all, and also Hope: *κοινὸν ὄνομα καὶ ἐλπίς* (Ignatius).

At the same time, Christians know themselves to be separated from Jews and heathen. They live as strangers and pilgrims in this world. They remained politically neutral to the Empire.

Paul maintains a relative value in the Roman State, and avails himself of his Roman citizenship; but even he would have been far from interfering in political matters. The early Christians remained politically neutral to the Empire, and conceived themselves as above the State, as members of a kingdom not of this world.

This feeling of elevation was the refuge of that Christian freedom which could fit itself obediently into worldly organizations (1 Clement lxi. 1). But the reverse side of this free obedience remained the consciousness of the absolute superiority of the Christian belief in a Saviour. For the Christians, Jesus had become the Redeemer, and therewith the claim of Cæsar to this title is disputed. The well-known words from the Epistle to Titus (ii. 11, iii. 4), which, with their pictures of the *Σωτήρ*, recall the Augustan inscriptions, show best the internal composition of the Christians at the time of which we are writing.

Through Baptism in the Name of Jesus was opened a new life, a behaviour corresponding to its model and conformable to the new standing; 2 Clement indicates its direction through the words: *τηρῶ τὸ βάπτισμα ἅγιον καὶ ἀμικτόν* (vi. 9), while 1 Clement calls the Christian ideal of life *ἐγκρατεία*. But this self-restraint and discipline follow from the expectation of Judgment and the hope of the speedy return of the Lord and the coming of His kingdom.

Thus the kingdom of God also appears among the riches of salvation in the post-apostolic age, and indeed in an eschatological sense. Papias and the Epistle of Barnabas (chap. xv.) are proof that it was an object of hope, thought of as in the future, and bound up with chiliastic conceptions.

A chiliastic mode of thought was also supposed to be found in Clement's first letter; it is questionable, however. He refers

to the Apostles simply and clearly: εὐαγγελιζόμενοι τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ μελλεῖν ἔρχεσθαι.

The declaration of Jesus' kinsmen before Domitian (according to Hegesippus) is proof of the eschatological application of the kingdom-idea. So, too, Hermas (Sim. x. 12, 8) and *Didache* (ix. 14). Only in Hermas it is the individual, not the Church, who will have to be gathered from the ends of the earth into the kingdom.

At the same time, the *Didache* lets it be understood that Church and kingdom are different quantities, and that no equation takes place. Only the Church shall enter into the kingdom of God.

Next come the Apologists. They rationalized the doctrine of God and the interpretation of Christianity as *new law*. They philosophized in Christology, but they preserved the peculiar Christian character of the eschatology. They adhere to the ἀνάστασις τῆς σαρκός, and offer no philosophically emasculated doctrine of immortality. The primitive Christian eschatology remained intact; in Justin, even Chiliasm. He will, however, be for himself ὀρθογνώμων κατὰ πάντα Χριστιανός (*Dial.* 80).

Aristides characterizes Christians as προσδοκῶντες ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν καὶ ζωὴν τοῦ μέλλονσι αἰῶνος.

The persecutions only reinforced the eschatological *motif*: the coming æon will glorify those who here suffered in the following of Christ. In contrast to the allegorizing of the Gnostics, Irenæus held fast to the millennium. Many ideas intersect in his eschatology. The idea of inheritance is used. Appeal is made to God's justice and satisfaction demanded. Or he seizes upon the idea of the world's Sabbath rest (*cf.* Epistle of Barnabas and Hebrews). Let it be fulfilled (according to Matth. viii. 11) through enjoyment of the Lord's Supper. These conceptions of rest for the righteous, satisfaction for the martyrs, find their culmination in the idea of the *dominion*. *Regnare* will begin with the coming *regnum*—a *motif* which is to be found in Tertullian, Cyprian, and Lactantius, also among Oriental theologians. Under the term *regnare* is expressed the longing for freedom from the present slavery and oppression. For Cyprian, the arrival of the kingdom will be made known through a wonderfully increased fruitfulness of the earth.

So much for the eschatological idea of the kingdom of God. We turn now to the development of the theocratic and spiritual conceptions, which generally run parallel in the great representatives, Origen, Augustine, Dante.

The first generations of Christians thought in contradictions—both on this side and on that—which were logically incompatible. But in their belief one followed another, in a

temporal sense. For their faith was the hope that the earthly world-state would in the near future be resolved into the "super-earthly" kingdom of God. In the second century, the transcendently rooted institution of the kingdom of God began to have a form in this world. It realized itself as an organized system in the world. The individual communities, represented through bishops, united themselves into inter-regional associations according to provinces. The third century went further, and matured the idea of the unity of the Catholic Church; and in the fourth century the idea was realized as an imperial Church. During this time strife alternates with periods of rest. In the former, Christianity was defended against the attacks of the Empire; the latter serves for its consolidation as a Catholic Church. This course of events is of marked importance for the development of the doctrine of God's kingdom, Church and State.

The Roman Empire and Greek civilization attack, but Christianity conquers. It not only fights with its adversaries, but vanquishes them. They are used as preparation and as stepping-stones. Tertullian assimilates the Roman doctrine of right to Christian theology. And Plato is christianized through Origen. As preparation (*προπαιδεία*) for Christianity, the ancient world is thus deprived of its essential elements.

It is not true that it penetrated, victorious and unbroken, into Christianity; no, Christianity widens its horizon, wills to live, and attracts to itself only what it needs for life. Thus Greek philosophy experiences powerful metamorphosis where it is received into Christian theology. That was a spiritual achievement of heroes who are rare. Origen was the greatest among them. He is not only responsible for the spiritual conception of the kingdom, but he also outlines a theocratic one.

Porphyry tells us that his lasting intercourse was with Plato; side by side with the *Timæus* he read the *Republic*. He lived his life as a Christian, but in his views on the things of the world and on divine things he thought as a Greek. That is to say, he was able to envisage simultaneously the "super-temporal" idea with its historical form, to understand the former as model for and goal of the earthly *polis*—i.e., to link together transcendence and immanence. The heavenly "idea" strives to be realized on earth, the kingdom of God as co-terminous with the Church, down to the final equation—the kingdom of God is the Church. On the other side, Plato's this-worldly *Republic* inclined again to the Christian kingdom of God and its transcendence. Plato had proclaimed God as the highest ruler, and invested His kingdom with theocratic features. Yet more important was his admission that this new

kingdom could hardly be realized upon earth, but only in the spirit, in heaven. The Ideal State contains more than history can fashion, or can put into terms of Christianity: the *civitas Dei* is the Church, and yet again more than the Church. Origen was the first who achieved this synthesis: To combine Plato's conception and doctrine of the state with the βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ; yet in such a way that Christianity was not platonized, but Plato christianized. He, first, was able to regard the Church as both a heavenly and an earthly state. To combine what logically is not compatible—the Here and the Hereafter—and yet to see this logical contrast as one and to combine them organically, remains a metaphysical vision of gigantic stature. At first, this combination of the historical and the super-historical, as Origen had conceived it, receded. It was first through Augustine that a theocratic conception of the kingdom of God as Church became dominant. On the other hand, in the average opinion of the history of dogma, the name of Origen is bound up with the spiritual understanding of the kingdom of God. This does not mainly relate to the historical units of communal life, but to the individual, the person. The place where, above all others, the kingdom of God comes to pass is the soul. Luke xvii. 21 is the classic place in the Gospel for this spiritual conception.

With the object of making clear the dramatic side of this spiritual occurrence, Greek ideals are brought into play: the rule of reason over the passions; or the conception of monarchical rule over subjects in a well-constituted state. The soul appears, above all, as the proper domain of God. The soul shall be ruled by God, and shall obey His spiritual laws. The soul remains the domain of the Devil if it allows sin to rule it. Hence the imperative, Rom. vi. 12.

As the control of desires and lusts is a matter for the will, and at the same time a subject for prayer, so the completion of the kingdom occurs in the individual. When, through Christ, the enemies within him are vanquished, he advances in knowledge, wisdom, and virtue. Thus the religious *motif* combines with the ethical to make a new composition. It experiences a mystic consummation: When God shall be τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν, then He will dwell in the soul, a μακαρία κατάστασις. And the thought continues logically: through this mystical indwelling of God in the soul, death is annihilated and everlasting life is anticipated. Besides the moral qualities of ἀγνεία and καθαρότης, it stipulates the salvation of ἀφθαρσία and ἀθανασία: and all is in the present.

Cyril of Jerusalem repeated the same ideas in his *Catecheses Mystagogicæ*.

For Gregory of Nyssa and Cyril of Alexandria the coming of the kingdom of God is synonymous with the efficacy of the Holy Spirit. Cyril of Alexandria is referring in this to Matt. xii. 28.

In a homily, *de oratione Dominica*, Chrysostom argues that the soul, when ruled by God the King, itself becomes a king who rules the world of flesh. Ephraem, on the contrary, emphasizes still more strongly Origen's point about the mystical moment of the indwelling of God.

In Augustine we find ideas akin to these. Again, the *regnum Dei* fulfils itself with the two tokens of the *regi a Deo* and *regnare cum Deo* in the realm of personal life. It is a question of the heart being inwardly ruled by God through the completed deliverance from the dominion of Satan, achieved through Christ. In this rule of grace, God remains the active principle, but His activity releases an independent activity in man, only supported by God (merit). So the kingdom appears as the operation of God, and a task for humanity. Augustine coins the expression "building the kingdom," and conceives its domain under the metaphor of a house or temple. Characteristic of the citizens of the kingdom is a mind directed on high: *in terrenis rebus levant cor in cælum*, whilst the *civitas terrena* includes all those *qui secundum hominem vivunt* (xix. 21). Augustine conceives of the reign of the martyrs and the departed with Christ as Sabbath-rest, like Barnabas and the Epistle to the Hebrews, or Rev. xiv. 13: *requiescunt a laboribus suis*. The reign of God shows itself in the joy of victory over tempting vices. True indeed that this victory and its joy upon earth remains markedly inferior to that which is to come. And *regnare* occurs here only *in spe*, and not *in re*. But, nevertheless, already immersed in the truth and quiet as Mary, they prefigure the future, and anticipate the vision of God through inner peace and outward work. Hope, which accompanies them through joy and sorrow, lifts the soul above this world to that hallowing indifference which is an *iucundari in Deo*.

Meanwhile, this personal meditation of Augustine is intersected by a world-historical consideration. He is not thinking of merely individual psychology, but of sociological quantities such as Church and State. The course of history has separated the *civitas cælestis* and the *civitas terrena*. The Church has become visible reality. As such she embraces simultaneously the elect and the sinners, the *boni* and the *mali*, just as in the field the tares grow next the wheat (Matt. xiii. 38 ff.) This passage seems to justify Augustine in combining two conceptions of the Church, one, ideal, mystical, spiritual,

religious, the other broadly catholic, hierarchically theocratic. Just as the two realms are combined, so is the *cœlestis* with the *terrena*. The former is for Augustine represented through the Church, the latter embodied in the Roman Empire in the realm of the world as a whole. Taken literally, the *civitas Dei* is the *vera ecclesia*, the *congregatio sanctorum*, the *numerus prædestinatorum*. Meanwhile the *electi* do not know each other; therefore no *communio* can be between these alone. This circumstance combined with the Church's position of authority must have caused Augustine to identify the *civitas Dei* with the hierarchically composed Church. This order becomes a necessary condition of the Church in the world. She must also use compulsion and authority. The organization becomes an instrument of God's dominion. Builders are necessary (*ædificantes*); they are the preachers and ministers in the Sacrament. Guardians are ordered (*custodes* and *superintendentes*); they are the bishops, and their rightful activity is of use to the kingdom of God. Here Augustine has accepted Cyprian's ideas of the Church as mediator of salvation, and developed this inheritance further, induced by the controversy with the Donatists. Thus the ideal conception of the Church is reduced to the popular because there is no certain criterion by which to establish the predestinated as the true members of the *sancta ecclesia*. The spiritual and the theocratic conceptions do not exclude each other, although the *sancti* attain their salvation only through the mediation of the organized establishment.

In addition, be it noted that the fate of Chiliasm was also decided by Augustine. It is true that Origen had already relegated it to the realm of fiction. But he only found approval with the educated. Chiliasm enjoyed further great popularity, although it never found expression in creed or rule of faith (Christian Sybilline Books, Methodius of Tyre, Apollinaris of Laodicea). In the West it had representatives longer (Commodian, Lactantius, Victorin von Pettau, Jerome), until with Augustine the change came here too, not through the advance of religious instruction, but necessitated by the altered situation in the Church's history—viz., the political position of the Church. When external oppression ceased through the christianizing of the State and the Imperial Church—in short, through the natural course of things—it was made clear what Chiliasm had once promised itself from the future, namely, victory and dominion over the world-power at enmity with Christ. Therewith a death-blow was dealt to Chiliasm, and Augustine's theology was only a seal upon conditions become actual. It had disposed of Chiliasm and taken the millennium to mean domination of the Church in current history. The

devil is bound through Christ. Through the new relationship between Empire and Church, brought about by Constantine, it is made impossible for the devil to lead the nations further astray. The reign of the sanctified with Christ is already fulfilled in the present time. The thrones of judgment are the *sedes præpositorum per quos ecclesia nunc gubernatur*.

Through Constantine's conversion and elevation to *Pontifex maximus*, Church and State were united, closely combined into a *res publica Christiana*. Meanwhile, this identification was not of long duration; external difficulties arose when a heretic like Constans, or an apostate like Julian, succeeded to the first Christian emperor. And a critical theologian such as Augustine did not share the illusion of a *res publica Christiana*, but differentiated most sharply between the city of God, which he sought to make synonymous with the Church, and the *civitas terrena*, which he identified with the Roman world-empire.

For the Middle Ages Augustine's conception of the city of God remained dominant. The State, essentially born of selfishness and sin, needs the consecration of the Church, which was founded in order to build the city of God upon earth. The State has no independence, since the emphasis lies in the other world, and the Church is called to be the guide thereto. The emperors, however, from Charles the Great onwards, held a different conception of the unity of Church and State—the idea of a *res publica Christiana* in which the Church was included under the care and protection of the Emperor. He was sovereign in the State, and the Pope was only to be, like Moses, the priest who prays. Strong emperors were able to produce a subservient papacy, but strong Popes, like Gregory VII., demanded the freedom of the Church, and effected it. Innocent III. maintained: *Christus Petro non solum universalem ecclesiam sed totum sæculum gubernandum reliquit*. The way was thus free for the Curialism of Boniface VIII. It was not only the episcopal reaction which checked the development which would naturally have ended in a dogma of infallibility; more important was the renaissance of Aristotelianism, which broke down the system of Augustine, and from which there emerged a literature in which the independence of the State and of the imperial authority was safeguarded by a frank recognition of a clear distinction between natural and supernatural. The State was shown to have no other worldly origin; it rests rather upon the natural human needs. Man is a ζῷον πολιτικόν. Immanent aims correspond to this immanent origin. The State protects the life of its citizens, and leads them to earthly happiness and virtue. Thomas Aquinas took over the

religious, the other broadly catholic, hierarchically theocratic. Just as the two realms are combined, so is the *cælestis* with the *terrena*. The former is for Augustine represented through the Church, the latter embodied in the Roman Empire in the realm of the world as a whole. Taken literally, the *civitas Dei* is the *vera ecclesia*, the *congregatio sanctorum*, the *numerus prædestinatorum*. Meanwhile the *electi* do not know each other; therefore no *communio* can be between these alone. This circumstance combined with the Church's position of authority must have caused Augustine to identify the *civitas Dei* with the hierarchically composed Church. This order becomes a necessary condition of the Church in the world. She must also use compulsion and authority. The organization becomes an instrument of God's dominion. Builders are necessary (*ædificantes*); they are the preachers and ministers in the Sacrament. Guardians are ordered (*custodes* and *superintendentes*); they are the bishops, and their rightful activity is of use to the kingdom of God. Here Augustine has accepted Cyprian's ideas of the Church as mediator of salvation, and developed this inheritance further, induced by the controversy with the Donatists. Thus the ideal conception of the Church is reduced to the popular because there is no certain criterion by which to establish the predestinated as the true members of the *sancta ecclesia*. The spiritual and the theocratic conceptions do not exclude each other, although the *sancti* attain their salvation only through the mediation of the organized establishment.

In addition, be it noted that the fate of Chiliasm was also decided by Augustine. It is true that Origen had already relegated it to the realm of fiction. But he only found approval with the educated. Chiliasm enjoyed further great popularity, although it never found expression in creed or rule of faith (Christian Sybilline Books, Methodius of Tyre, Apollinaris of Laodicea). In the West it had representatives longer (Commodian, Lactantius, Victorin von Pettau, Jerome), until with Augustine the change came here too, not through the advance of religious instruction, but necessitated by the altered situation in the Church's history—viz., the political position of the Church. When external oppression ceased through the christianizing of the State and the Imperial Church—in short, through the natural course of things—it was made clear what Chiliasm had once promised itself from the future, namely, victory and dominion over the world-power at enmity with Christ. Therewith a death-blow was dealt to Chiliasm, and Augustine's theology was only a seal upon conditions become actual. It had disposed of Chiliasm and taken the millennium to mean domination of the Church in current history. The

devil is bound through Christ. Through the new relationship between Empire and Church, brought about by Constantine, it is made impossible for the devil to lead the nations further astray. The reign of the sanctified with Christ is already fulfilled in the present time. The thrones of judgment are the *sedes præpositorum per quos ecclesia nunc gubernatur*.

Through Constantine's conversion and elevation to *Pontifex maximus*, Church and State were united, closely combined into a *res publica Christiana*. Meanwhile, this identification was not of long duration; external difficulties arose when a heretic like Constans, or an apostate like Julian, succeeded to the first Christian emperor. And a critical theologian such as Augustine did not share the illusion of a *res publica Christiana*, but differentiated most sharply between the city of God, which he sought to make synonymous with the Church, and the *civitas terrena*, which he identified with the Roman world-empire.

For the Middle Ages Augustine's conception of the city of God remained dominant. The State, essentially born of selfishness and sin, needs the consecration of the Church, which was founded in order to build the city of God upon earth. The State has no independence, since the emphasis lies in the other world, and the Church is called to be the guide thereto. The emperors, however, from Charles the Great onwards, held a different conception of the unity of Church and State—the idea of a *res publica Christiana* in which the Church was included under the care and protection of the Emperor. He was sovereign in the State, and the Pope was only to be, like Moses, the priest who prays. Strong emperors were able to produce a subservient papacy, but strong Popes, like Gregory VII., demanded the freedom of the Church, and effected it. Innocent III. maintained: *Christus Petro non solum universalem ecclesiam sed totum sæculum gubernandum reliquit*. The way was thus free for the Curialism of Boniface VIII. It was not only the episcopal reaction which checked the development which would naturally have ended in a dogma of infallibility; more important was the renaissance of Aristotelianism, which broke down the system of Augustine, and from which there emerged a literature in which the independence of the State and of the imperial authority was safeguarded by a frank recognition of a clear distinction between natural and supernatural. The State was shown to have no other worldly origin; it rests rather upon the natural human needs. Man is a ζῷον πολιτικόν. Immanent aims correspond to this immanent origin. The State protects the life of its citizens, and leads them to earthly happiness and virtue. Thomas Aquinas took over the

doctrine of the origin and purpose of the State, and held that Monarchy was the best political form. But he was, however, not content with such a civilization of this world. He went on to show that at the point where the work of the State ends the work of the Church begins, in order to make the citizens of this world citizens also of heaven, and to guarantee eternal blessedness side by side with earthly happiness. Thus both State and Church possess an independent origin and existence. The function of the State is to care for the good of the individual and of society in this world, the Church for their good in the other world.

In this sense Dante was the great Aristotelian and Thomist. In his political writing, *De Monarchia*, he emphasizes the independence of the Emperor who has to care for freedom and peace, and whose authority comes direct from God, and is, therefore, parallel with the authority of the Pope. The guilt of breaking the true relationship between the two he lays at the door of the Church, which had become secularised, and he insists that the Church must be regenerated by the spirit of Him who told the representative of the Roman Empire, "My Kingdom is not of *this world*." Dante, then, in his great poem the "Divine Comedy," transferred this double scheme from the macrocosm of the world to the microcosm of the soul, and showed, exactly as Origen and Augustine had done, the close relation which exists between the theocratic and the spiritual interpretation.

The period of the old scholasticism passed away, and the idea of a world-conquering emperor was shown to be a dream. There arose concrete powers claiming their right to exist: national states appeared, vied with one another, struggled, and made alliances. The national monarchy in France conquered the papacy under Philip the Fair, whereas in England the papacy was victorious in the struggle between Henry II. and Pope Alexander III. Afterwards, however, the national state demanded and won its freedom.

Only episodic during the Middle Ages was the appearance of prophets who thought eschatologically and proclaimed the advent of the heavenly King. The theocratic idea with which the spiritual idea was associated remained dominant throughout the Middle Ages.

W. VOLLRATH
(Erlangen).

THE IDEA OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD FROM LUTHER TO THE PRESENT DAY

AUGUSTINE's identification of the millennial kingdom of God or Christ with the Catholic Church, in which Christ was already reigning with His saints, had far-reaching consequences in the theory and, on occasions, in the practice of mediæval Christianity on its institutional side. Yet the difficulty of arriving at a satisfactory delimitation as between Church and Empire, or, later on, between Church and national kingdoms, was a continuous obstacle to any complete realization of the theocratic idea.

With the Reformation there is, on the whole, a turning away from the theocratic idea and its institutional associations. The kingdom is related to the individual rather than to society, and its meaning found in inward dependence upon God and in moral goodness. So Luther says: "God's kingdom is nothing else than peace, modesty, humility, purity, love and virtue of all kinds." So the kingdom is for the believer the highest good, religiously and ethically, and he who has a part in it is raised above all earthly good and evil. Similar views were taken by Melancthon and Zwingli. The former asserts *Regnum Christi non est externum*, and sees the realization of the kingdom within the Church as accomplished by the proclamation of the Gospel and the exhibition of faith and love. For Zwingli the kingdom is the offer of heavenly goods, and consists in faith and righteousness. With Calvin's characteristic stress on man's subjection to the divine will, an opening is made for a return to the substance, if not the form, of older ideas. The beginnings on earth of an external realization of the kingdom may be looked for when the emphasis is placed on the divine law, and "God is said to reign among men when . . . they determine and deliver themselves to be ruled by Him." Part of the duty of the civil power is to promote the interests of the kingdom by preserving true morality and religion. We can see how with such conceptions the Genevan polity and theocratic Puritanism are naturally harmonious.

From another point of view, that of the millennial Anabaptists, the external element in the idea of the kingdom was brought to the front. On the one hand, the Church was conceived of as a community of saints, outwardly known (and so not an invisible election), perfectly pure, and identical with the spiritual kingdom of God. On the other, the belief in the approaching overthrow of the world-kingsdoms led to the notion of the divine kingdom as soon to exist on earth with the saints

as its citizens. In the episode of Münster we have a further stage of this creed—the kingdom may be advanced and established by violence. But this was not a characteristic development.

In seventeenth-century Pietism the protest against conventional Christianity produced an emphasis upon the idea of a true reign of God in the hearts of believers, and distinctive Christian activities, such as missionary enterprise, were regarded as works of the kingdom.

For the Pietists there was no necessary connexion between the kingdom of God and the existing Church. For Kant, also, the idea of the kingdom supplied a means of criticism of the empirical Church. To him the notion of the kingdom was a wholly ethical one. An ethical society living according to the laws of morality was in his thought, the kingdom of God upon earth.

With Schleiermacher begins the attention in modern theology to the idea of the kingdom of God as to a religious notion of the first importance, and the examination of it in connexion with the doctrine of Christ and of the Church. In his work on the *Christian Faith* he says (Cross's translation), "The Christian experience of a growing dominancy of the God-consciousness, and, in the same degree, of a growing blessedness . . . is owing to participation in a new community which springs from the divine operation. That is to say, the kingdom of God has come and the collective life of this new community constitutes it. This new life in men is by faith referred to Jesus Christ as its author, which is the same as to say that in him the kingdom of God appears."

Ritschl fully recognized the importance of Schleiermacher in recovering the true conception of the "teleological nature of the kingdom of God." But in his emphasis upon the idea of the kingdom Ritschl surpassed his predecessor. He conceived of Christianity as an ellipse determined by two foci, the doctrine of redemption through Christ, and the doctrine of the kingdom. In his theology, as formulated in the constructive volume *Justification and Reconciliation*, the kingdom of God is "the final end of the world," and towards the establishment of this kingdom the love of God is directed. "The Kingdom of God . . . is the correlate of God's love in so far as it is the association of men for reciprocal and common action from the motive of love—an association which is determined, no longer by the natural conditions of affinity in the narrower sense, but by the unity of man's spiritual constitution." What the idea of the kingdom involves in the ethical sphere is clearly set forth in the following passage:—"The universal ground of all moral conduct towards our fellow-men is that the Christian religion

has for its end the kingdom of God. This association of mankind, of the most comprehensive nature, both extensively and intensively, cannot be realized otherwise than through works, concrete action, and speech. . . . Now the moral law is the system of those ends, dispositions, and actions, which necessarily arise out of the universal end of the kingdom of God." This kingdom is the supra-mundane end of the world, and to set it up among men was the purpose of Christ's life, and Ritschl insists that a true understanding of Christ's divinity is possible only when He is conceived "as the living Head of the community of God's kingdom." No close connexion is formed by Ritschl between the notion of the Church and that of the kingdom; the followers of Christ are a Church in virtue of being a "*worshipping community*"; it is in their loving actions and in their creation of a moral fellowship that they constitute the kingdom of God.

Among theologians inspired by Ritschl, Kaftan deserves special notice, since in his *Dogmatik* the notion of the kingdom is given a more definitely eschatological character, while the Church, "the community of those who are through faith united with Christ in a unity of one life and spirit," is described as "the kingdom of God in the present stage of its realization."

Modern English attention to the idea of the kingdom dates from F. D. Maurice's work *The Kingdom of Christ*. Maurice's conception, which is developed in controversial opposition to various systems of thought, is of the kingdom as a spiritual society, intended to be universal, and possessing its own characteristic doctrines and rites, revealed by Jesus Christ and "founded upon a union established in his person between man and God." Maurice identifies the kingdom and the Church far more closely than other theologians to whom we have referred, but the peculiarities of Maurice's position make it singularly difficult to establish a true relation in his theology between the ideal and the actual. In contrast with Maurice, Arnold's view is entirely simple. The kingdom of God is the whole body of Christians, making up State and Church alike. It is a doctrine of an unsacerdotal, national theocracy.

If we wish to distinguish types of thought among English theologians and religious teachers as to the kingdom we shall find that the differences depend on how far the kingdom is regarded as essentially a supernatural, eschatological reality rather than as the perfection of human society in this world, and on the extent to which a close relation is formed between the ideas of the kingdom and of the Church. But one must beware of assumptions as to the probable outcomes of the different ideas of the kingdom, from which a start is made. Enthusiasm for the progress of the kingdom in this world has,

in notable cases, gone along with a strong conviction that the primary note of the kingdom is its transcendence rather than its immanence. On the other hand, those who have specially emphasized the immanental aspect of the kingdom have not always brought closely together the notions of the kingdom and the Church.

To take instances of this ethical, immanental theology of the kingdom first, Dr. J. S. Candlish brings to the conclusion of his Cunningham Lectures on *The Kingdom of God* the conviction that "the kingdom of God shall not remain for ever a mere ideal, but be one day a reality in the form of a perfect human society, in which all shall in love serve one another, and so serve and glorify God." Akin to this humanitarian ideal is the presentation of the meaning of the kingdom by Dr. W. N. Clarke in *The Christian Doctrine of God*. He interprets the coming of the kingdom as the thorough determining of all human relationships "by the mind of Christ, which is the will of God." According as this has or has not come to pass, the kingdom has come or is still absent from the earth. That the kingdom is realized "in part among men upon earth" through the permeation of human institutions with "Christ's spirit of love and brotherhood" is also the teaching of Principal D. S. Adam in his *Cardinal Elements of the Christian Faith*, but he balances this with a recognition of the fact that the full realization of the kingdom belongs to "a spiritual realm . . . whence sin has been for ever banished, and where sorrow and death shall be no more."

A doctrine of the kingdom which makes much fuller provision for the eschatological aspect, draws the relation between the kingdom and the Church closer, and at the same time finds in the idea of the kingdom both the demand and the power for regenerative social and moral activity in the world, is characteristic of such theologians as Baron von Hügel, Bishop Westcott, Canon Scott Holland, Bishop Gore and Dr. Temple, the Bishop of Manchester. Von Hügel's constant emphasis on the association and interplay of transcendence and immanence, the eternal and the temporal, the other-worldly and the this-worldly derives from what he finds in the teaching of Christ as to the kingdom (*Eternal Life*, pp. 56-66). Westcott's social enthusiasm sprang from his belief in the implications of the Incarnation, and in the faith in the Incarnation was included faith in the kingdom of God "at once spiritual and historical: eternal and temporal: outward and inward: visible and invisible: a system and an energy. It depends both for its origin and for its support upon forces which are not of earth" (*Social Aspects of Christianity*). His "Social Gospel" was taken up by Scott

Holland and Gore, and fused with a conception of the Church which owed itself to other traditions than that which he represented. Thus, in *Prayer and the Lord's Prayer* Gore interprets the prayer for the coming of the kingdom as a prayer for the spread of the Church, but also for "the manifest and open exhibition" of Christ's empire in the whole universe, pre-eminently through individual and social regeneration.

A similar inclusiveness characterizes Dr. Temple's thought. The coming of the kingdom means world-righteousness. Thus, in the *Kingdom of God* he writes: "Only when the world is converted and subjected to the power of the Cross shall we see the coming of the kingdom." In *Church and Nation* we find the description of the specific life of the Church as "the very spirit and power of the kingdom." In *Christus Veritas* more stress is laid on the eschatological side. On the one hand "the end of History is the complete coming of the kingdom"; on the other, "whether, or how fully that kingdom can come on earth is unimportant. It can come more than it is come yet; and here or elsewhere it will be established in perfection in the souls of men."

To one other modern English theologian attention must be drawn. Dr. A. Robertson, afterwards Bishop of Exeter, took as the subject of his Bampton Lectures *Regnum Dei*. In his conclusion there is a drawing together of the ethical and the eschatological, the immanent and the transcendent aspects of the kingdom. In this world and in the next, without as well as within, the kingdom is to be sought. As to the relation of the Church to the kingdom, the idea of a Church wielding coercive powers and expressing the kingdom by governmental action seemed to him invalidated by history, while a spiritual identification of the Church with Christ's kingdom corresponded to truth. And while a kingdom of righteousness and peace and joy ought to be the object of human effort, it was impossible to know whether God's moral government among men was destined to be more perfect.

Finally, we may note the importance of the idea of the kingdom and the difficulty of finding one generally accepted interpretation of its significance. And this suggests that any attempt such as, in their very different ways, Ritschl and Mr. Clutton-Brock made, to control other theological notions through the idea, or, as Mr. Clutton-Brock said, through the seeing or perception of the kingdom, is not likely to be successful. The idea of the kingdom is not more immediately luminous than other theological ideas; only in association with them can its true Christian meaning be determined.

J. K. MOZLEY.

THE IDEA OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD FROM LUTHER TO THE PRESENT DAY

IN the conception of the kingdom of God from the beginning of the Reformation we must distinguish broadly three periods.

The FIRST PERIOD consists of the creative early time in which the kingdom of God is understood afresh as a rich manifoldness, a complex of various elements, and the post-Reformation time in which the full wealth of elements falls apart again. Like every classical age (*cf.* primitive Christianity), the generation of the Reformers succeeded in understanding with the synoptic vision of genius the diverse sides of the matter all at once in its unity and integrity. Subsequently this power fails. In the following generations one or another element is from time to time emphasized at the expense of the others. Thus credal types develop which all derive from the originally unified conception.

Lutheranism comes to emphasize the second petition of the Paternoster thus: "*Thy kingdom come!*" Here the inward side of Luther's idea is brought into prominence. The kingdom of God and of Christ is not of *this* world. The reformed (Calvinistic) theology inclines to the emphasis, "*Thy kingdom come!*" For it the important thing is that here and now the kingdom of God works in the power of the Spirit—that men, in particular, must translate the will of God on all sides into action. At the same time, we must here emphasize the fact that both these conceptions lie nearer to one another than a third, which is as a rule cherished by mystical, enthusiastic, and kindred movements. Here the emphasis is rather "*Thy kingdom come!*" The urgent longing to pass out of *this* world into *that* kingdom can be expressed in very various ways; both by way of world-avoiding, inward contemplation, which separates space-time existence absolutely from the kingdom of God, and also by way of social-political revolution, which seeks to bring this world by violence to perfection. In the Lutheran and Reformed conception, the tendency is not to draw an absolute contrast between this æon and the kingdom of God, nor yet simply to place both on the same level. Rather there exists between time and eternity a relation of tension and reciprocity which needs careful definition. The third type distinguishes itself clearly just at this point.

Finally, it must be strongly emphasized that the whole period is marked by a *reaction to mediæval ideas of the kingdom of God* (by way of dissolution and remoulding). Hence it is not to the point to bring present-day discussions under the category of Lutheran *versus* Calvinist or similar antitheses.

The SECOND PERIOD is marked by *reaction to secular culture*. It cannot be sufficiently emphasized that it is a new thing in human history when in the modern period the conception of a secularized world appears by the side of traditional culture-systems founded upon religion. It not only forces Christianity to react to new ideas; it offers it at the same time *starting points* for a modern conception of the kingdom of God. If the outcome of the First Period was the break-up of a unified idea, now a struggle must be entered upon for a new understanding. Attempts are begun to interpret the message of the kingdom of God upon an altered basis.

I limit myself to the task of outlining an important presentation of those attempts.

Emanuel Hirsch has described "Modern European Thought on the Kingdom of God." He establishes three main forms—two Western and one German.

1. English philosophers of Natural Law (Hobbes, Locke, and before them, Grotius) separate sharply the kingdom of God from the order of this world. The other-worldly kingdom of God, with its King, Jesus, is consolation for the time after death, a place of eternal recompense for earthly life. But the ordering of life here below must be directed by the reasonable rules of the Natural Law, that is as much as to say, by the Sermon on the Mount. If only within time free course is given for the development of lower into higher forms of society (for instance, from a military state into an industrial and legal one), then, in every generation, man will find a way to live. Sound self-interest and public good are identical. Social evolution is the theme of life here, "kingdom of God" of life hereafter. In practice it means justification of the English social order.

2. Critics and Utopians of French sociology (J. J. Rousseau, St. Simon, Karl Marx) do not make the matter quite so easy. They see an antinomy in the contrast between the kingdom of God and the existing order. According to Rousseau's intuition of genius, the social order rests upon freedom for the individual and brotherly love for the community. The bridge between the two is built by *égalité*. This bridge, however, in so-called "higher" forms of society has been destroyed through private property. The antagonism between rich and poor ruins freedom and brotherhood. That is what inspires to social revolution, which finally results in socialism's war on private property. The theme of the kingdom of God becomes completely secularized; it becomes the political programme for changing the conditions of private property. Heaven is being devoured by the earth. In a practical sense, this idea means justification of the French and all subsequent social revolutions.

3. German idealism (Leibnitz, Kant, Fichte on one side, Schleiermacher, Hegel on the other side) creates a third doctrine. It does not so far dissolve the idea of the "other-worldly" kingdom of God as to see in social evolution the creative theme of earthly development. Neither does it secularize it so much as to hold that social revolution is the realization of the kingdom of God on earth. Rather, it sees, in the spirit of Kant's Theory of Knowledge, an irremovable tension and interaction between the invisible time-and-space-less world of God and of the spirits on one side, and our own known world of experience, real in time and space, on the other side. What happens here is not identical with the eternal, but also not apart from the eternal. It is the manner of appearance, the form of existence, that the eternal takes in time. Evolution is unending. Even as two parallel lines meet only in infinity, so likewise only in infinity shall the world of appearance and reality, evolution and kingdom of God meet. Upon earth the spiritual kingdom of God can only be served by defending it and preparing for it. And though, in this sense, the circumstances of our earthly nature are not definitive, nevertheless, so long as we live here, they are to be respected by us. So the nation presents itself as a natural basis for the ordering of the social body. Not from individuals, nor from mankind as a whole, but from the collective personality of a people, a society can be built up in which a life of the Spirit of God is possible. From this came (for Hegel), in practice, the justification of the Prusso-German idea of the state. Hirsch's discussion concludes with a critique of all three ideas.

For our context it is important to observe, in this presentation, that no one of these three forms of thought succeeds in preserving the complex of N.T. ideas of the kingdom of God unimpaired in its fulness. The English type robs the coming kingdom of the moment of "this-worldliness" (derived from the Jewish-theocratic). The German type does not, indeed, so sharply cut out one element from the complex, but in its synthesis it perverts the specifically biblical and Christian element, in that it transforms the history of revelation and salvation into a profound metaphysic mainly concerned with the timeless, fundamental relation of world and eternity.

A THIRD PERIOD follows which—so far as one can speak of it at present—is principally marked by the revival of the primitive Christian idea of the kingdom of God. For various reasons the effort has become strong to win back the finality and fulness of the N.T. conception. This is, after the negative issue of the two periods just outlined, symptomatic for all the newer theological interpretations. We stand in the midst

of this movement. Consequently it is impossible to speak about it with finality. But I would attempt to indicate certain tendencies which, taken together, point to a remarkable interpretation of N.T. and modern thought.

1. Christianity must think *universally*. Methodism and Pietism of the eighteenth century have the merit of having accomplished in Protestantism the *extensive* universalism of world-missions. Social Christianity of the nineteenth century, in addition, has triumphantly preached the intensive universalism of more thorough home mission work, training to an active Christianity, and the building up of a Christian community. There is arising a new understanding of the fact that Christianity should not be expressed in terms of individualism, but within the atmosphere of corporate life ("Church," group mind, etc.). From Schleiermacher to Rauschenbusch, from Ritschl's ellipse with the two ignition-points down to the passion of the *social gospel*, everywhere the universalism and collective sense of modern times show themselves.*

2. The *idea of change and transformation* conforms to this Protestant universalism, which is greater than the Roman because it is limitless. Movement, progress, development, advance are words of the unwritten, effective modern *credo*. English independentism has the merit of having first clearly seen this truth. Robert Browne and John Robinson do not believe in the finished, but in a progressive Reformation. When the first Pilgrim Fathers set out for the New World, Robinson said to them in farewell: "Brothers, whether I shall see your faces again upon earth, God in Heaven alone knows; but if the Lord have determined that or not, I ask you, before God and His holy angels, not to follow me any further than you have seen me following the Lord Jesus Christ. If God shall reveal to you anything through another of His instruments, be ye ready to receive it; I am convinced that the Lord will allow yet more truth to emerge from His holy word; I cannot sufficiently deplore the position taken by the Reformed Church which has come to finality in religion, and now will not go beyond the witnesses of her reformation. The Lutherans stand by Luther, the Calvinists by Calvin; but though these men were burning and shining lights in their time, yet they have not fathomed the whole doctrine of God, and if they were alive now, they would be just as willing to receive further illumination as they once were to receive the first. For it is

* Cf., for discussion on this first point, my exposition, *Das Reich Gottes in amerikanischer und in deutscher Theologie der Gegenwart*, Giessen, Hessen (A. Toepelmann), 1926; and cf. the survey: Rauschenbusch, *A Theology for the Social Gospel*, pp. 27-30. Here are found the most important European and American names among preachers of the Social Gospel.

impossible that the Christian world, in so short a time, should have broken through the long anti-Christian darkness, and should all at once have revealed the sum of Christian knowledge."*

Here we see the kingdom of God no longer as a static quantity, but rather in powerful motion. Every generation sees a horizon for the goal of their work, beyond lie the goals of desire for future times. But with the years not only man changes, but also this horizon changes with the generations. There is a history of the kingdom of God. As Protestantism understands it, that is the essential purport and content of the formal universalism of modern times.

This means the revival of the sense of what is especially Christian in the doctrine of the Spirit. Archbishop N. Soederblom once said: "That which for Buddhism means the doctrine and for Islam the Koran, is for Christianity—Jesus Christ." Should we not say in a still more decisive sentence: the *Spirit* of Jesus Christ? We are not bound with an unchangeable fixed entity, but we dare believe in a principle of present revelation working along all ways.

We do not believe in the *Deus otiosus* of the philosophers, but in the *Deus actuosus* of the prophets and reformers.

3. Yet universalism and dynamism are still not the most important. The really decisive thing, the restoration of primitive Christianity, consists in the resurrection of *eschatology*; in philosophical language, of *the Christian idea of time (Zeitidee)*.

The Church has conceived eschatology in terms of space. That was the deepest encroachment into the substance of Christianity. Out of the "kingdom of God" "Heaven" was made. And still, in the three types of modern philosophy with which Hirsch deals, the space-conception (*Raumbild*) is always dominant. Not as if one simply in the ancient sense put heaven "above" the earth. But as a comparison the space-conception remains dominant. That is fatal and must be altered if one is to arrive at the full Christian insight into reality. Indeed, mainly over the space-conception has the conflict between Christianity and modern thought arisen. Christianity would not have suffered so severely from this conflict if it had retained its Old Testament-primitive-Christian idea. The latter is almost independent of the space-conception. But it is not the Church's teaching whose individual eschatology crystallizes mostly in the sentence: The soul is immortal (which is a piece of heathen nature philosophy), and whose universal eschatology mostly ends in metaphysics: Heaven, Hell, Purgatory. The whole of eschatology speaks then of a "hereafter,"

* Weingarten, *Die Revolutionskirchen Englands*, Leipzig, 1868, p. 33.

in which we shall live on, and be either blessed or damned. But the message of Christianity is *Resurrection*. That means, seen from our side, death for the individual (Heb. ix. 27) and for the whole (2 Pet. iii. 10 ff.). Therefore, do not look across to the "other side," but into the future! And what we see there, on the level of time, is clear and well known to everyone on its negative side: dying. For it is the nature of this world that it "passes away." "To be in time" means nothing but "passing away." The positive side, on the other hand, is ordained by God, and is called New Creation, everlasting life, life through the Spirit, Resurrection.

Space, from the point of view of the observer, is always relative. The directions are reversible without the actualities thereby being altered. It is quite different with time; a theologian such as Karl Heim constantly refers to the enigmatical and somewhat gruesome fact that time is not reversible. It is true that from the point of view of the actual present, the past and the future are non-existent. But the past is "dead," and the future only "sleeping." The past, since it passed us by, has received an imprint, which the future lacks. The past has been touched, the future is untouched. We are fatefully and guiltily interwoven with the past. It is irrecoverable and irreparable. Time cannot return! Therein lies its terrible solemnity. The contemplation of time fills us with a sense of responsibility and deep earnestness. Space can at best only stir us to longing. He, therefore, who changes the time formula arbitrarily for the space formula, robs the Gospel of its brutal severity and earnestness, and rapidly approaches mysticism. For in conceptions of space mysticism is at home, whereas in time revelation is.

Every hour (*ώρα*, St. John), every moment (*καιρός*, as in 1 Cor. vii. 29) is charged with fate *ὁ καιρός συνεσταλμένος ἐστίν*.

From creation to the end of the world this clock of God runs down. The individual, between birth and death, is fitted into greater collective forms—family, nation, humanity. These, again, between their birth and death, are fatefully anchored for a given space of time, fitted into still greater planetary and cosmic periods. But all these times rush on into the one time, which flows on from God's first creative act to the great change of the world in the Resurrection at the Last Day. Looked at from God's time-plane, everything is absolute, nothing is relative. For *irreparabile fugit tempus*. The Gospel now consists in this: To the perception of the fleetingness of time it opposes the knowledge that "God's kingdom comes." It turns away the evil (*unheil*) of perishableness through the message of salvation that the kingdom of God is coming.

Time is categoric. The primacy of the *ethos* is rooted in it. The conflict, above which even Fichte did not rise, is appeased as soon as one discards space conception for the kingdom of God, and substitutes time both in thought and in speech. The concrete reality gives to the "Nu," "the hour," its singular quite individual character, in a way which is not to be found either before or after. But the coming kingdom—that is to say, the universal dynamic power of God in time—gives to every *kaipós* its unconditioned quality, its absolute seriousness. The "today" (e.g., in the Epistle to Heb.) decides. In the *fieri*, not in the *esse*, lies the whole.* All the history of revelation behind us, the coming of the kingdom before us, touch each other in this moment in ourselves. The Spirit drives. It leads us ever into new truths, breaks through old horizons, and, as it advances, transforms goals of desire into goals of will and endeavour.

But at the end is the harvest. It is not the Fifth Act in the drama. The goal of history, the "kingdom made perfect" (or perfected), comes into view neither by means of mere evolution (post-millenarian) nor catastrophically miraculous (pre-millenarian). What we parabolically call harvest or judgment, resurrection, salvation, or damnation, all lie at the end of time: therefore after, behind the Fifth Act of the World Drama. Logically, we can only comprehend the end in a negative way, seeing the circumference concavely from the inside of the circle. The convex circumference is only perceptible from the outside. It can only be symbolized by us, now, in a parable. We are *certain* about death, we *believe* in resurrection. We *see* the end of the world coming, we *hope* for a "new heaven and a new earth." We hope! This is—perhaps even more than belief and love—the specific cue and watchword of Christianity.

HEINRICH FRICK

(Giessen).

THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND THE CHURCH

ONE of the outstanding contrasts between the Synoptic Gospels and the Apostolic writings in the New Testament is the prominence in the former of the conception of the kingdom, and its virtual disappearance in the latter in favour of the conception of the Church. By "the kingdom" St. Paul means the sphere of God's realized sovereignty and mercy, which is partly a matter of expectation (1 Cor. vi. 9, 10, xv. 24; Gal. v. 21; 2 Tim. iv. 18), and partly of present experience (Rom. xiv. 17;

* Not only the individual. Luther's First Thesis of 1517 is true of *all* life.

Col. i. 13); and it is in this latter sense that "kingdom" and "Church" become almost convertible terms. For the Holy Spirit, who gives to the Church its unity and its life, is an "earnest" or "first instalment" of the kingdom of Heaven; and those who possess the Spirit possess the kingdom. For Christians, that is to say, the kingdom or rule of God is experienced as righteousness, joy, and peace in the Spirit-filled community. Dr. Deissmann, in his *Paul*, and Dr. Heiler, in *The Spirit of Worship*, have shown that this was essentially a corporate experience. By living "in the Spirit" or "in Christ" believers were *ipso facto* members of "the body of Christ," and no contrast nor cleavage was felt between the individual and the social or institutional sides of the Christian life.

The description of the kingdom-Church which best brings out its relation to human society is that which speaks of it as "the Israel of God" (Gal. vi. 16). No less than Christian monotheism, the Christian conception of the Church had its roots in Judaism, and derived continuously from it. Christianity took over, that is to say, from Judaism a group-consciousness, a corporate sense, which it baptized into Christ. Moreover, just as Christian monotheism was not a new thing, but the expansion and enrichment, through the revelation in Christ, of what had gone before in Judaism, so Christian Churchmanship was likewise. The group-consciousness of the Jewish nation-Church was at once narrowed and enlarged by its baptism into Christ. It was narrowed because only a portion of the chosen people responded to and believed in Christ: it was expanded because the promises and grace of God were no longer limited to Israel, but were now offered to the whole world. There emerges, therefore, from the matrix of Judaism an organism which has a historic and outward continuity with that from which it comes, but which is destined to grow from the first on universal or Catholic lines; and its bond of unity is no longer that of physical lineage, but the "one body, one spirit" of the Apostolic fellowship.

The New Testament makes it clear how great an importance attached from the first to the position of an Apostle. On the eschatological view of Christ's teaching and life, the number of the Twelve whom Jesus appointed had a direct reference to the number of the tribes of Israel, since it was in a new Israel that the kingdom was to find expression (Matt. xix. 28); and the care taken to fill up the number after the death of Judas shows the significance attached to the office. So far as we can judge, it was from the Apostles that pastoral and administrative authority—i.e., that of the presbyters and "deacons"—derived; and it

is in that sense that the Church's officers took their commission "from above" and not "from below." The "democratic" conception of the Ministry developed in Dr. Carnegie Simpson's *Church Principles* is valuable as a reminder that the Apostolic office was not divorced from the life of the whole Church; but it cannot show that there was any Church apart from the authority of some Apostle behind it. Between the Apostolic oversight of the Church or churches in the first century and the episcopal oversight which we meet with in the second there is, no doubt, historically speaking, a missing link. But that there was a continuity between the two is rendered probable not only by the obscure testimony of Clement, but much more by the absence of any evidence of dispute or controversy such as would have been inevitable if any serious innovation had been made.

The Church emerges, then, into the Græco-Roman world of the first century as an organic body, centred in Christ and filled with His Spirit, in principle universal, and under the oversight of men of Apostolic office. It was thus a community of marked and distinct individuality; and this distinctness is amply attested in the metaphors used to describe it. Already, in the teaching of Jesus Himself, the body of those who believed in Him were compared to "a city set on a hill," "the light of the world," "the salt of the earth"—all of them metaphors which emphasize peculiar and beneficent properties in relation to environment. It is the property of all these to preserve their individuality amid their environment, and, while preserving it, to exercise an influence on all around them. The metaphors, however, are not wholly similar. Those of the city and the light emphasize the Church's separateness, and it is this thought which is developed in the Johannine writings into the great antinomy of the Church and the World: while the metaphor of the salt, like that of the leaven, draws out the converse truth of how the Church's influence is exercised by its intermingling with the life of secular society. The Church has, therefore, a double rôle to play *vis-à-vis* human society—that of apartness, witness, challenge from without, and that of sympathetic penetration, guidance, help from within. The justification of the Catholic Church and its various developments has been that, on the whole, it has kept this synthesis more steadily in view than Protestantism. Inevitably it involved and involves great risks—more so than either the rigorously "transcendent" Church-doctrine of Calvinism or the diffusive tolerance of Liberal Protestantism.

The necessity of the Church aiming at this synthesis, moreover, will make us chary of endorsing without serious reservations such a principle as is expressed in the formula "A free

Church in a free State." As against Erastian views, it is certainly important to maintain that the Church is an autonomous body, which in no sense derives its corporate entity from the secular power. But, on the other hand, it is equally important to maintain that the Church, as itself a social organism (and not simply a voluntary aggregation of individuals), cannot possibly be indifferent to other social organisms around it, such as schools and universities and, above all, the State. If the Church is to influence these, as it is bound to do, and to bring into their life the principles and powers, the values and the grace, of the kingdom of God, it must enter into some kind of *concordat* with these other organisms. The fallacy of "the free Church in the free State" is that it involves a false dualism, contrasting "Church and State" as though they were "Church and World." Whether, however, we study the smaller organisms such as the school, or the larger such as the State, we have to observe that many of the ends which they subserve are identical with those which are served by the Church; and that there is nothing intrinsic to either school or State which should cause it to be ranged with the World rather than with the Church. History, moreover, tends to show that it is where the relations of the Church with these other organisms are close that they themselves maintain their organic life most securely and are most successful in achieving their higher ends. And this is what we should expect if the Church is the expression—partial, but real—of the kingdom of God.

Finally, it should be observed that the Church is not confined in its scope to this present visible earth, but has always taught that the greater part of its members are in the unseen and spiritual world. Its citizenship is in heaven; and, though this citizenship is exercised for a time on earth, it is developed and consummated beyond. The reforming activities of the Church in human society are not among its deliberate ends, but rather a by-product of its spiritual life. That is not to say simply that its aim is to "make saints," but rather that it conceives of the whole of humanity as created, in principle, for a destiny which cannot be realized within the bounds of earthly life. Nothing less would seem to do justice either to the sweep of St. Paul's evolutionary philosophy in Ephesians iii. and iv. or to the apocalyptic visions of the Seer of Patmos. Both alike, in different ways, speak of a Church which is at the last co-extensive with humanity; though it is not on this earth, nor by any natural process of development, but in the kingdom of Heaven and by God's transcendent acts of judgment and grace, that this destiny is achieved.

E. G. SELWYN.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND THE CHURCH

1. CHURCH is the community of believers gathered together through the word of Jesus Christ in the power of the Holy Spirit. As such she is at once the work of, and the instrument of, the Holy Spirit. Because the faith and the communion are a work of the Holy Spirit, the Church of God means the dawn of the kingdom of God in history—she is the Body of Christ, the House of God, the Temple of the Holy Spirit.

At the same time the Church is the instrument of the Holy Spirit, therefore the means of grace through which God wills to effect the coming of the kingdom. The Church is the instrument of God since she is commissioned to publish abroad the word of Jesus Christ. The publication demands that the "word" be ever newly made flesh. The Church may not speak the word if she "is" it not also. She makes known the Cross of Christ when the vicarious ministry of the priesthood accompanies their witness with words made deeds, and the "law of Christ" is made visible in her. Thus the brotherly communion and work of the Church belong essentially to her witness.

2. THE CHURCH AND THE CHURCHES.—The word "Church" has a twofold meaning in that it can indicate the Church of God as well as the historical church-forms. This twofold meaning and the problems proclaimed by it have their foundation in the two-sidedness of the nature of God's Church itself.

The Church of God is gathered together solely through historical appeal, and yet, at the same time, solely in the super-historical operation of the Holy Spirit. The Church in history becomes "churches"—i.e., fellowships—which, gathered around the means of Grace and the institutionalism that bears them, carry and administer them still further. This empirical "church" assembled round Word and Sacrament, institution and work, and administering them as an organized fellowship cannot simply be set on the same level with the Church of God: the Church of God is gathered together through God's hidden working of the Spirit—thus far the Church is "invisible." But on the other hand, one must also reject any false separation of the Church of God and the empirical churches: the Church of God is built solely through the service of the empirical churches. Therefore, between the Church and the churches is a connection which belongs to the very nature of the Church, and a tension which is of the nature of the Church in its specifically historical, super-historical, quality. Neither is to be overlooked.

The churches must know that they can never overcome the

tension on earth, and yet, for the service and the witness of the coming kingdom, they must constantly struggle to overcome it.

(a) *The Exclusiveness of the Church.*—The churches obey the universal offer of salvation in that, as "churches of the people," they are wide open. (Child baptism.) But obedience to the universal commission leads them into the whole trouble of "popular" Christianity. The Gospel indicates not only universal breadth, but it means also the call to individuals to decide, relinquishment of the world, selection, gathering together. Therefore the churches must not only witness to the breadth but also to the exclusiveness of the Church of God. They must gather together, and yet cannot appear to be doing so, for no man and no church may forestall the gathering of God.

(b) *The Purity of the Church.*—The churches have their being in history and therefore are exposed to the forces of deceit, of sin, and of torpor, not only in the life of their parts, but also in their confession and dogma, institutions and orders. They cannot protect themselves once for all against this through legalized adherence to the Bible or traditionalism. The world penetrates into the Church—neither dogmatic nor pietistic assurances prevent it—once for all and absolutely. Rather the Church here is always being called to new battles, to ever new repentance which will refer both to her dogma and her orders. Only thus has an empirical church a part in the promise that the Spirit shall lead into all truth; her experience, then, is that out of the New Testament words the living Truth breaks through deceit and torpor, ever anew directing and creative.

(c) *The Unity of the Church.*—The Church's separation into divided and mutually contending churches belongs to her existence in history. The multitude of the churches is certainly partly conditioned by the law of the individualization of all historical life, and, as such, witnesses to the creative riches of God and to the fulness of Christ. But the juxtaposition of the churches is not only a consequence of the historical laws of separation, but also of guilt, error, one-sidedness, distortion of the Truth. Faith can only suffer the tension between the unity of God's Church and the juxtaposition and mutual contention of the historical churches because it knows that the wondrous God, through His Gospel, can gather together His people even in a crippled and erring Church, in spite of all the chaos of human institutions—that is the true "catholicity" of the Church of God. But at the same time the churches are called to struggle for the unity of the Church as testimony for the coming kingdom of God. The desire for the unity of the Church cannot go the way of false neutralization of serious religious antithesis; rather it leads into the fight for the Truth which is the foundation of

unity, into the fight with and for each other, to the true "polemics," which shall set free the hidden or repressed truth of the others (as also our own).

3. THE CHURCHES AND THE NEW WORLD.—(a) The biblical message of the kingdom of God concerns not only "souls," but the whole creation; not only a new humanity, but a new world is promised. From that it follows that the Church which shall witness to and actively guide towards the kingdom of God is morally bound to take an interest in the economic, social, political, and international organizations of this world. With the cosmic range of the Gospel hope, the whole of the criticism of civilization and of service to human life has been given to the Church.

(b) The service of the Church cannot, indeed, mean the transformation of world organizations into the kingdom of God. The Church knows of the difference between any possible world-order or form of civilization and the coming kingdom of God. She also knows that to the end of history the demons and the deadly laws of a world of sin will work in her. Therefore she does not forget the narrow bounds against which any Christian activity runs up.

(c) But that does not mean renunciation of the *work* of Christianity (*die Tat der Christenheit*). Her activity is certainly not designed to bring hither the kingdom of God (the Gospel knows not *this* teleology!), but it is a prayer for the coming kingdom, a testimony for what has come and what is to come. The waiting of the community upon the Lord occurs in obedient work, but work must always humble itself anew to waiting. Eschatology and deeds belong together. One without the other is vain.

The Church does her service to the life of civilization and to world organizations chiefly *indirectly*—that, out of her, men of lively conscience and eschatological seriousness go into all professions and offices; but also *directly* and publicly through criticism of her responsible speakers to the state and administration, to social and international life. That the Church, which truly is and remains also a piece of the world, directs this criticism equally against herself is a proof of its earnestness.

PAUL ALTHAUS
(Erlangen).

THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND THE STATE

1. THE problem of the relation of the kingdom of God to the State is a part of the more inclusive problem of the relation of the kingdom of God to the forms of human association in general. These forms of association are the setting in which our earthly life is lived, and as men who stand within these earthly ordinances, we hear the proclamation of the kingdom of God and pray for its coming.

2. The essential forms of human association are the family, the nation, economics, and the State. Each one of these has its root in the primitive foundations of human life, and its effects extend to the highest departments of our spiritual life as well. In each one of these departments one particular aspect of human life and its vicissitudes is especially active, and, indeed, the influence of any one of them depends largely on the character of an individual or on the particular circumstances of a generation. There are three distinct typical groups in young Germany, in which economics, the nation, and the State are respectively felt as the determining and binding factor in human life.

3. The message of the Kingdom of God may call a man out of any of these three groups. The preaching of Jesus about the coming Kingdom takes a predominantly negative attitude to all these social forms of earthly life. This call (*ἐκ-κλησία*) brings before us a threefold presentation of the case: all these forms of life belong to a transitory world ruled by sin; in none of them is the ultimate purpose of life (the will of God) realized and presented; consequently, none of them can be absolutely binding on mankind.

4. It is significant that Christ pointed out the contrast between the kingdom of God and the character of the world in reference to the necessities of political life (Matt. xx, 25 *seq.*), and that the first conflict of the early Christian communities with the world around them was kindled by their opposition to the State. The State—not only particular and perhaps inferior forms of State, but any State whatever—with its established laws, gives effect to its own order by means of external authority, and preserves its historic existence and vocation against all outward opposition by exercising its force. Hence the State is the extreme antithesis of the kingdom of God, which is based on a surrender to the will of God proved by service and sacrifice. The State thus exhibits itself as the necessary ordering of the life of nations under the domination of sin. It is, therefore, no accident that enthusiastic Christian bodies which were

mainly concerned with the coming of the kingdom of God should have maintained and taught either a complete disavowal of the State or a merely passive attitude towards it as to a temporal evil which must be endured.

5. Any Christian who evades active responsibility for the organizations of earthly life makes the kingdom of God either a purely inward thing or something wholly invisible and other-worldly, or else a hope for the future which is beyond all earthly realization. In this way God's claim to sovereignty over this world is denied, and the organizations of human life given over to demonic powers. This is shown just as clearly in the relations of the sexes and in national associations as in the large contexts of our economic and political life.

6. The proclamation of the kingdom of God not only comes to us as individuals who stand within these given social organizations, but it places these social organizations also under the sovereignty of God and of His coming kingdom. This implies two things: first, this proclamation implies the proclamation of divine judgment upon the sinful and ungodly aspect of this world. Only through the message of forgiveness are we called to life in the new kingdom; the faith which hears and receives this message regards, not only individual men, but also the great social systems of human life, in the light of the justifying grace of God. Only as justified sinners can we seriously regard our human life on earth as service to God, in the family, in the nation, in economics, or in the State. This faith in justification applied to every department of life guards equally against a deification of these natural ordinances and against a complete indifference and irresponsibility towards them. Applied particularly to the State, that means that the State is in no sense the kingdom of God, but an organization among sinful men founded on force; in the light of the kingdom of God (which means in the light of God's will judging and saving us), the Christian can and must acknowledge and honour the State, and, in so far as he is called thereto, render responsible service to it. This point of view alone prevents inward insincerity and a terrible confusion between political necessities and the ordinances of the kingdom of God.

7. On the other hand, the State, like each of these earthly systems, possesses essential points in which it becomes a type of the coming kingdom of God, and trains us for service in it. Since the State creates and maintains order, confines surging life within fixed limits, places the individual under an obligation to service and sacrifice, and so makes the conflicting forces fruitful for a higher whole, it becomes, not only in speech but in reality, a type of the kingdom of the Eternal King. It is,

therefore, not by chance that the language of Christianity speaks of its highest and final revelations in metaphors taken from the life of the State.

8. Above all, the State, because its vocation is to fulfil the historic mission of the nation, forces its citizens to consider their life in its historical context. The sense of the State is responsibility to history. Since all history, if it is not to be quite meaningless, necessarily evokes enquiry into the beginning and end, political thought demands an eschatological faith for its own abolition and completion. Because earthly kingdoms stand within history, they are an indication that the kingdom of God is not a timeless "other-world," but something historical, a kingdom that is actually coming.

9. After a period during which earthly standards of life were regarded, with a naïve matter-of-factness, as the goal of our ambitions, German youth of today is experiencing a passionate longing for forms of community life in which is found an ultimate aim and an ultimate obligation. The question of the German youth movement is the question of the kingdom of God. Thus it is of decisive importance whether the kingdom of God is to be regarded as in absolute opposition to all forms of earthly life, or whether the nature of the kingdom of God will be learnt through the symbols of any particular form of human association. And it is not a matter of indifference whether the secret of sexual love or the life of the nation or the State will be felt as the symbol of the secrets of the kingdom of God. The seriousness with which the State and its ordinances are regarded prevents individualistic, mystical, or sentimental misunderstanding of the kingdom of God.

W. STÄLIN
(Münster).

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

WE do not remember to have published any documents in THEOLOGY with greater pleasure than the papers read to the Canterbury Conference of German and English theologians which we print this month. Our only regret is that the papers are necessarily short, slightly shorter in a few cases than those actually submitted to the Conference; and, still more, that it is not possible to include any *précis* of the animated discussions to which they gave rise, or of the addresses made to the Conference on special subjects by Mr. J. K. Oldham and the Dean of Canterbury. The papers as they stand, however, afford much material which is indispensable to any careful thinking on the main theme. The Editor desires to express his particular thanks to his sister, Miss Lucy Selwyn, Professor Frick, Sir Edwyn Hoskyns, and Professor Dodd for their labours as translators. The series of papers will appear in identical form, in German, in the May number of *Theologische Blätter*, edited by Professor Karl Ludwig Schmidt. An account of the Conference itself from the pen of the Dean of Canterbury appeared in the *Guardian* of April 16, and we will only add here an expression of the gratitude felt by all the members of the Conference to our host and hostess for their gracious and kindly hospitality.

We have received a copy of *The Odes of Solomon*, a selection rendered into English verse, by the Reverend S. P. T. Prideaux, D.D. (S.P.C.K., 6d. net). These translations, which were first printed in this Journal, constitute a charming collection of Baptismal or Confirmation hymns, twenty in number. They illustrate with great vividness the spirit of devotion in the Church of the second century, perhaps even of the first, and there is not one of them which would not adorn a service in the Church of today. In the case of each hymn reference is given to a suitable tune from the *English Hymnal*.

We have received from the S.P.C.K. a copy of *A Catechism of Christian Faith and Practice* (price 2d.). It contains over 300 questions and answers; and a first survey shows it to be full of sound and detailed Catholic teaching, with far closer attention to moral instruction than we have noticed in other similar catechisms. But such a handbook of Christian teaching as this deserves far more than a note, and we shall hope to discuss it more fully later in the year.

A notice has reached us of a proposed scheme for the publication of a new text of the Greek N.T., with full critical apparatus; and the enterprise is in the hands of a committee consisting of the Bishop of Gloucester (Chairman), the Bishop of Oxford, Sir Frederick Kenyon, the Dean of Christ Church, Dr. Nairne, Dr. Souter, Dr. Burkitt, and Dr. Streeter. Since Tischendorf's edition was published, much new material has come

to hand in the form of new Uncial MSS., Minuscules, Versions, and critical editions of the writings of the Fathers. The names of the committee are a guarantee that a work of rare and unusual importance may be expected; and they will have the assistance of Dr. Professor von Dobschütz in Germany and Dr. J. H. Ropes in America. The work is international in more senses than one: for it has become the occasion of a graceful interchange of learning, by which English scholars are co-operating with the production in Germany of a new Wetstein, while German scholars have promised support to their English colleagues for a new Tischendorf. Meanwhile, despite the generous help of the Clarendon Press, funds will be needed; and the sum of £1,000 for five years is now asked for. Subscriptions should be sent to the Treasurer, the Dean of Christ Church, Oxford.

STUDIES IN TEXTS

A cloud received Him (Acts i. 9).

If we are to believe some recent writers, the account of the Ascension is based upon an obsolete cosmogony. The disciples believed that heaven lay above a solid "firmament," and the story implies that they saw the Lord levitated from the earth and watched Him go up through the air till He reached the clouds. A careful examination of the passage makes it at least doubtful whether this was the impression intended to be conveyed. Our minds are so influenced by recollections of mediæval artists and Victorian picture-books that we are apt to forget that the story was told by people who had in their minds quite a different set of pictures.

1. It is noticeable that St. Luke, the only writer who gives an account of the Ascension, not being an eye-witness, uses words to describe it which really convey no theory as to its manner.

Luke xxiv. 51. He was parted from them (*διέστη*), a neutral word: "and was carried up into heaven" (*ἀνεφέρετο*) is omitted in many MSS., but if it is authentic, it is also used of taking Peter, James, and John up into the Mount of Transfiguration (Matt. xvii. 1; Mark ix. 2). It is again neutral.

Acts i. 2, 11, 22 (also Mark xvi. 19) (*ἀνελήμφθη*). This is indeed used of the "sheet" in Acts x. 16, but it is also used of St. Paul in Acts xx. 13, 14, when all that is meant is that they "picked him up." Again a neutral word.

Acts i. 9. "As they were looking he was taken up (*ἐπὶ ῥοθῇ*) and a cloud received him" (*ὑπέλαβεν*). This is the most definite statement. But does it necessarily imply the extensive levitation of the theory described above? It all depends on *where the cloud was* which "received him," and for that we need to consider what we have called the set of pictures in the disciples' minds.

2. We are told, also by St. Luke, that after the Resurrection, when they had begun to recognize Him more fully as Lord, Christ had expounded from the Old Testament the things concerning Himself (Lk. xxiv. 27, 44, 45). Their minds, already well filled with Old Testament imagery, were stimulated to apply it to Him. There are two lines of thought which may be traced.

(i.) The cloud was the "chariot" of the Lord (Ps. civ. 3). It is interesting that Luke omits the reference to the "clouds of heaven" in the trial before the Sanhedrin (Matt. xxvi. 64; Mark xiv. 62). It was not part of his or of Theophilus's hereditary vocabulary. It seems to have been regarded as a way to the earth, for most of the mentions of it in O.T. show it on the ground.

There is a second use of the idea of the cloud as connected with God, which seems to regard it rather as a kind of earthly door into heaven. The Jews may have thought of God dwelling in heaven "above the bright blue sky," but throughout the O.T. this cloud appears, if not in contact with the ground, at no great height above it.

The first mention is of the pillar of cloud and fire in the wilderness (Exod. xiii. 21, 22). When the Tabernacle was completed the cloud "covered" it, and the glory of the Lord filled it (Exod. xl. 34-38; Num. ix. 15-23, xiv. 14, xvi. 42; Deut. xxxi. 15-16). When there was to be a closer communication "the Lord came down in the cloud" (Num. xi. 25), "came down in a pillar of cloud and stood at the door of the tent" (Num. xii. 5).

Again, the fire and smoke "descended upon" Sinai (Exod. xix. 18, xx. 18, xxiv. 16). Later in the history we are told that "the cloud filled the house" (1 Kings viii. 10, 11; 2 Chron. v. 13, 14). Isaiah seeing the vision of the Lord saw the house "filled with smoke" (Isa. vi. 4). Again the cloud was apparently on the ground level.

Then there was the experience shared by Peter, James, and John, on the Mount of Transfiguration, when the cloud "overshadowed them" (Matt. xvii. 5; Mark ix. 7) and "they entered into the cloud" (Luke ix. 24) as Moses had done of old, and from it they heard the voice of God, and in it Moses and Elijah were, it seemed, taken back into heaven. They did not apparently see the going away of the cloud. "They fell on their faces" (Matt. xvii. 6) and when they looked up again, the cloud and Moses and Elijah were gone. These are practically all the references there are to the cloud.

(ii.) The second line of picture thought is found in Ezek. x. and xi. Ezekiel had seen (i. 4) the chariot of the Lord coming, "a great cloud and a fire infolding itself." It came near enough to the ground for him to describe its detail and to hold converse with the Lord. In his vision of the desecrated Temple he again saw the glory and the cloud filling the house (x. 3, 4), and this glory left the house and "stood upon" the mountain on the east side of the city—i.e., the Mount of Olives—and went away. In the vision of the restored Temple he saw the same glory, "even according to the vision that I saw" in chaps. x. and xi., return from the east to the city.

Can we restore the story as it appeared to those who first told it? Would it be somewhat as follows? The Lord of Glory led them out again to the mountain on the east side of the doomed city (Luke xix. 41-44), where His chariot of cloud was awaiting Him low on the hill. There may have been levitation as He entered it, but as they watched it rise from the earth their attention was called away by the two men who told them that He would return again, and we hear no more of the course of the cloud. With their background they had no doubt of it. We may hold that He entered the spirit world directly as at other times. The narrative as it stands does not seem to tie us to any cosmological theory; what we and the disciples deduce from it is another matter.

It has been said that the vision of the Lord on Patmos holding the seven stars in His hand taught the Churches of Asia more of His might than pages of theologizing. So the sight of Him thus assuming His divine prerogative and departing by the cloud was the most convincing proof of His Godhead that could have been offered to a company of Jews before the coming of the Spirit. Later, when the Gospels came to be written, a Church, mostly without such an O.T. background, knew it from other experience. The cloud was not evidence to them in the same way.

M. D. R. WILLINK.

NOTE

CLERGY DISCIPLINE

I WAS reading one day, in the Cathedral Library at Winchester, when our learned librarian put into my hands the two volumes of Gibson's *Codex Juris Ecclesiastici Anglicani*. "Here," he said, "is a learned and admirable work by one of your predecessors." I turned over many pages until I came to Gibson's account of Rural Chapters, and the duties of Rural Deans, in days gone by. Thus I came upon a discovery which was to me of great interest. Relating the duties of Rural Deans Gibson refers to the Council held at York in the year 1195, under the presidency of Hubert Walter, Archbishop of Canterbury and Papal Legate. He quotes Roger de Hoveden as his authority (Rolls Series, vol. iii., p. 297).

The decree *Susceptus de crimine* (No. 18 in Wilkins' *Concilia*, No. 15 in Rolls Series) of that Council laid it down that a person under censure should be admonished privately ("in friendly sort") three several times by the Rural Dean (*Decanus loci*); that, if he should not amend he was to be admonished in the presence of two or three witnesses: finally, if he persisted in his wrongful way, it was to be told to the Church—i.e., publicly and formally related to the Chapter. Here was a historical precedent for clergy discipline which is of great interest. I have been quite unable to discover evidence of the carrying out of this decree; perhaps it exists, but I do not know where to look for it. It is possible, however, that the decree shared the fate of many decrees declared at Legatine Councils—i.e., it was quickly and conveniently forgotten. For such Councils were unpopular in this country, and the Decrees of a Council held at York which was presided over by an Archbishop of Canterbury would be doubly distasteful to the Northern Province. But whatever was the fate of this particular decree, its inherent justice and sound commonsense must be apparent to all. Moreover the procedure is strictly scriptural. This is the method which our Lord indicated (see S. Matt. xviii. 15-18). It is the "discipline" of a family; it breathes nothing of dire and dreadful consequences upon the offender; it is a method of sweet reasonableness; it calls for nothing but the employment of moral forces; it could not cause the resentment which is invariably created by legal processes. When Mr. Gladstone received the Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Courts, he wrote to Bishop Stubbs, one of the Commissioners, as follows: "For a very long time I have felt more and more, first that we have in the main to look to moral forces for the govern-

ment of the Church (I do not refer, of course, to questions of conduct), and secondly, that the Church can afford, in a very great degree, to dispense with other aid."

No one, who has any knowledge of the result of using what Mr. Gladstone called "other aid," can doubt that here are wise words.

Prosecutions, in what have been called "ritual cases," have always failed of their purpose. They have aroused resentment, caused bitterness and made rebels.

Yet discipline there must be; each priest cannot be a law to himself. How is an effective discipline to be exercised? How is the mind of the Church to be made a real and controlling force, either to regulate or restrain or raise the practices of the clergy?

Might we not hope to find an answer by resorting to the method indicated by Gibson?

Of course there must be a Diocesan Synod in every diocese. This Synod would determine the "uses" of the diocese. This being done let us suppose that A refuses to comply with the "use." What shall be done to A?

I would suggest (1) that the Bishops should see A and admonish him "in friendly sort." On no account should the Bishop write a letter of admonition; such letters seldom lead to any good. A Bishop is a Father in God, and every father knows, or ought to know, how much better it is to talk to an erring son than to write to him about his fault.

(2) If A remains obdurate, then let the Bishop "take with him two or three witnesses." These might well be men who, by their learning and ecclesiastical sympathies, would add force to the Bishop's appeal.

Or here the precedent created by the Council of York might be closely followed; that is to say, the Rural Dean, with some assessors, should be sent to remonstrate with A.

(3) If all this is without effect then A's name and offence should be "told to the Church." This could be done by solemnly naming him at the Diocesan Synod and Conference, at the Ruri-decanal Chapter, and Conference; and by a communication to the secretary of the Parochial Church Council.

And what then? I should think nothing more would be necessary.

But even if it were necessary to proceed further it would be possible, in my opinion, to do so without causing mischief. If action before a Court was unavoidable, then all reasonable men would be obliged to admit that every effort had been made to avoid a hateful necessity. Gospel and Catholic precedent would have been followed; A would have wilfully refused to "hear the Church;" the consequences would be the result of his own choice.

LIONEL E. BLACKBURNE.

REVIEWS

HARTLEBURY CASTLE, WITH SOME NOTES ON BISHOPS WHO LIVED IN IT AND OTHERS WHO LIVED ELSEWHERE. By Ernest Harold Pearce, Litt.D., D.D., F.S.A., Bishop of Worcester. S.P.C.K. 12s. 6d. net.

In these busy days, the exemplary energy of a bishop who sets himself the task of illustrating the history of his diocese is much to be admired. Dr. Pearce's study of the life of Bishop Cobham has already proved his devotion to the official records of his see, and his dedicatory epistle to the Bishop of London at the opening of the present volume contains an enthusiastic confession of the stimulating effect of an episcopal register upon him. His praise of those tonic qualities will be readily echoed by others who, though without his subjective interest in the common forms which his predecessors have bequeathed for his use, have found their way to the life that lies behind them and have experienced its power to fascinate. Although his main theme is the palace of the Bishops of Worcester, his book is to some extent a history of the see, told in a series of biographies, concise, but full of detail and abundantly documented. There may be two opinions of the method of arrangement by which the architectural growth of the Castle is treated recurrently, in connexion with the prelates who altered and added to it; for to some exact antiquaries a building is of more importance than those who have used it. Dr. Pearce, however, with all his love of minute facts, does not allow them to conceal his main points. The thread of his story is never broken by undue digression, and, if we lose sight of the Castle from time to time, it comes into view at the appropriate moments, when the description of its component parts can be studied with the aid of Mr. Harold Brakspear's plan of the building. The history of the fabric, from the time when, in 1268, Bishop Godfrey Giffard received licence to crenellate it, presents no serious complications. The Bishop believes that portions of Giffard's work remain in the present walls, though the house was largely rebuilt in the fifteenth century. It was very thoroughly restored, with considerable additions, by Bishop Fleetwood in the reign of Charles II., and various internal alterations were made by the eighteenth-century bishops who made it their home. The last, and not the least interesting, addition was the remodelling of the west side of the building by Bishop Hurd, who housed his

library in a new room on the first floor, and so gave Hartlebury the possession which is its special distinction.

Until the eighteenth century, few bishops held the see of Worcester for many years together, and, of the sixty-four successors of Giffard, only a very few have come within measurable distance of his record of thirty-four years. Several of these are mere names, while the history of others belongs to that of the sees to which they were translated. Dr. Pearce lingers over two whose registers are of peculiar interest, Henry Wakefield and John Carpenter. Of Wakefield himself there is not much to be said: he belongs to the class of government official who won his way to a bishopric and performed its duties "with decency and decorum." Carpenter, on the other hand, has a more definite personal interest, although he was less distinguished in public life. As Provost of Oriel, and as the second founder of the college of Westbury-on-Trym, which Giffard had attempted unsuccessfully to augment with gifts of prebendal churches, he has received some attention. The survey of his career in this book puts the facts of his life upon a surer footing, especially as regards his relation to the college of Westbury. The personalities of medieval prelates, however, are not easily detached from the cloak of official correspondence which clings to them; and the Bishop, when he comes to the later history of the see, has the help of material which leaves less to shrewd conjecture. His series of portraits of eighteenth-century bishops, from William Lloyd, who came to Worcester from Lichfield in 1699, to Richard Hurd, who died in 1808, is drawn from miscellaneous sources which he uses to great advantage, and from which we learn much of life at Hartlebury during the period. Of Hough and Hurd, in particular, he writes with skill and sympathy, and succeeds in making a good case for Hurd against those who regard him merely as the parasite of Bishop Warburton. The remains of two of Lloyd's chaplains, the diary of Francis Evans, and the letters of the Oriental scholar, known as "Table" Marshall from the series of chronological tables which were the result of his learned labours at the Castle with the aged Bishop, afford an excellent foundation for the account of a life which was "one long refusal of leisure." But the most entertaining chapter in the book is provided by extracts from the letters of Francis Hopkinson, a young Pennsylvanian kinsman of Bishop Johnson, who received much kindness at Hartlebury from the Bishop and his sister, Mrs. Sarah Johnson, and apparently deserved his welcome. Mr. Hopkinson was a musician, and attended the Three Choirs Festival at Gloucester in 1766, where he heard the *Messiah* "and other solemn pieces of Music performed by the best Hands"; while he employed a

somewhat slender poetic talent in complimentary verses to "Illustrious Worcester" and his sister, and in valedictory stanzas to one Myrtilla, who was possibly a fellow guest and kinswoman.

Enough has been said to show that Dr. Pearce has given a singularly attractive form to a work founded upon scholarly labour. He notes with emphasis the prevalence of exchanges of benefices at the close of the fourteenth century. In this respect the registers of other dioceses may be compared with those of Worcester for evidence of a widespread evil which has received very little attention from historians; and it might have been noted that Bishop Wakefield's register contains a copy (fol. 97) of the mandate issued in 1392 against the "choppe-chirches" or brokers of benefices which Wilkins printed from the register of Archbishop Courtenay. The tenure of benefices by a friar-bishop acting as a suffragan was not, as suggested on p. 97, unusual: such livings were frequently held *in commendam* to provide the suffragan's expenses, and the case of Richard Wycherley has a parallel, for example, in that of the Dominican William Hogeson, Bishop of Dara, who, as Foxe's suffragan at Winchester, held the rectories of Chilbolton and Burghclere. Dr. Pearce handles his mass of detail with enviable accuracy, and it is hard to find him tripping. We suspect that the Boot-hall at Gloucester (p. 266) is Mr. Hopkinson's version of the Booth-hall; but Warburton's parsonage (p. 281) was not in Nottinghamshire, but in Lincolnshire. Here and there a contribution to diocesan history has been overlooked. Mr. Willis Bund's introduction to Giffard's register has been supplemented within the last few years by more than one article upon the relations of the see with the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, who came into collision with one another over that outlying portion of the diocese of York which lay on the outskirts of Gloucester; and the career of Bishop Wakefield has been already sketched, with that of other pluralist clerks of his period, in a recent volume of the Associated Societies' *Reports and Papers*. These, however, are small points, and the Bishop of Worcester's book is not only a worthy tribute to the historic house to which he has given his wholehearted affection, but a signal example of the enlightened use of records, published and unprinted, for the purposes of ecclesiastical history and biography.

A. HAMILTON THOMPSON.

STUDIES OF THE SPANISH MYSTICS. By E. Allison Peers, M.A.
Sheldon Press. 18s. 6d.

Three years ago Professor Peers published *Spanish Mysticism, a Preliminary Survey*, in which he gave extracts, with trans-

lations and short notes, from the works of thirteen mystical writers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. He now lays his readers under a further debt of gratitude by bringing out the first volume of *Studies of the Spanish Mystics*, a magnificent book dealing with St. Ignatius of Loyola, Luis de Granada, Francisco de Osuna, St. Teresa, St. John of the Cross, Luis de León, and Juan de Los Angeles, and completed by a very valuable bibliography. Further volumes will be forthcoming as the immense work of dealing with old editions and manuscripts, new renderings, commentaries, biographies and critical studies proceeds. Professor Peers has spent long days in libraries at Madrid, Barcelona, Seville, Valencia and other towns. He has searched monasteries and convents for obscure treasures, and visited private houses where collections might contain manuscripts or treatises compiled by mystical writers.

The works of St. Ignatius, St. Teresa, and St. John of the Cross are comparatively well known to English students. Those of Luis de Granada are easily accessible in modern editions to those who read Spanish. There remain, however, a number of mystics whose writings are of a very high order, but which have never been circulated in this country, and are almost forgotten in Spain. Professor Peers has brought to light a whole series of works equally interesting to the students of mysticism and of literature. Perhaps in no country of the world, at any time in history, has spiritual experience found such striking and beautiful expression as in Spain in the "Golden Age" of mysticism. Seeker after seeker stormed the heights of heaven and wrote in vivid and stirring language of the glories of the quest. There is a vigour, a virility, about these Spanish mystics which is amazingly attractive. They write not only with the enthusiasm of the idealist, but with the sureness born of experience. These men had no doubt in their minds that communion with God was the greatest good in the world. They are not timid or hesitating or diffident in their mysticism. Their wholehearted adventurous search for the Divine was inspired by the same bold spirit which sent the Spanish explorers across unknown seas, and made their soldiers some of the most reckless that the world has ever seen. Eagerness in pressing forward right to the presence of God is of the very essence of Spanish mysticism. But it is not a rough, untamed boldness; rather a disciplined courage, a courteous and mannerly intrepidity. Spanish mysticism, then, has a savour all its own.

Professor Peers does not consider himself bound to write any pages of Apologetic on behalf of mysticism as a whole. He assumes that the reader is, if not necessarily at home in the high realms of spiritual experience, at least sympathetic to mystical

ideals. Without doubt St. Teresa is his favourite among the saints, and all that he writes is from the Teresan point of view.

Few saints have combined practical activity with contemplation as successfully as St. Teresa. We admire her sanity, her power of organization, her attention to the small details of convent life, as well as the astonishing flights of her soul. The extraordinarily clear account which she gives of the contemplative's gradual development through states of consciousness ever increasing in beauty, is unmatched in mystical literature. St. Teresa is one of the most lovable as well as one of the most wonderful of mystics. She is never pretentious, never affected, never queer. Even when favoured with raptures and ecstasies, she does not lose her common sense. The blessed Marguerite Marie Alacoque used to drop the convent dishes because she was overwhelmed with spiritual delights, but St. Teresa was as capable as she was devout.

Closely associated with St. Teresa, is St. John of the Cross. So small in stature that St. Teresa jokingly referred to him as "half a friar," he was a giant in strength of character. Of him she wrote: "Although he is small in stature, I know he is great in God's eyes. No friar but speaks well of him, for his religious life, though short, has been one of great penitence. We have had some differences in business matters, and have been so far wrong as to be vexed with him, yet we have never seen the least imperfection in his conduct."

It was St. John of the Cross who helped St. Teresa to found monasteries and convents on the Reformed Carmelite rule. The first "house" was little more than a hovel. "The house was so small and filthy that it seemed impossible to use. The first chapel was the tiny porch, roughly adorned with the branches of trees. There was but one room on the ground floor, and a garret above, and in these they had scarcely room to stand upright. The only windows in the hovel were a few holes in the roof, and for beds they had a little straw, with stones for their pillows."

These early years were times of constant hardship. The friars of the mitigated order, jealous of the superior austerities of their Reformed brethren, stirred up enmity against St. John and his companions. St. John was imprisoned. In a cell 10 feet long and 6 feet wide, lighted only by a tiny hole in the wall, he composed, it is said, his magnificent poem "Although 'tis Night . . ." At last Our Lady appeared to the prisoner in a vision, and pointed out to him a window through which he was to make his escape.

The remainder of St. John's life was, as Professor Peers points out, "a record of more than ordinary activity," much time being

spent in difficult and often dangerous travelling from one convent or monastery to another. He was elected Prior of a house at Granada, but was again persecuted, deprived of his office, and banished to the monastery of the Reform at Peñuela. Professor Peers tells us how, austere and unbending to the end, St. John would not accept any alleviation of suffering during his last illness, even refusing to listen to the sacred music which he so much loved. He was only forty when he died, but he had lived long enough to write two of the most penetrating books on the mystical life ever composed, *The Ascent of Mount Carmel* and *The Dark Night of the Soul*.

"Of all Spanish writers, St. John of the Cross has left us the most complete account of the higher slopes of Mount Carmel. He has touched but lightly upon the lower stages of the journey, but the grace, eloquence, and power with which he writes of the more ethereal realms have perhaps been exceeded by no other mystic in all literature. Parts of his work are beyond all description. They can only be fitly read with the hushed reverence of a receptive soul."

Professor Peers also gives an exceedingly interesting account of St. John of the Cross' other prose works, and of his verse. In Spain he would seem to be more valued as a poet than as a religious teacher. His poems are untouched by gloom or austerity. They are full of rich and varied imagery, of colour and of movement, and show, as Professor Peers says, the most delicate sensibility towards Nature. Of his poems a Spanish writer declared "they seem to be the work not of a man but of an angel."

St. Ignatius of Loyola is of course chiefly famous as the founder of the Jesuit Order; Professor Peers, however, shows him to us in his role of mystic. Ignatius was first of all a soldier-gallant, "A man framed for the Court or the field, my lady's bower or my lord's council chamber," as Francis Thompson said. Converted after he had been severely wounded in battle, Ignatius became a soldier of the Cross without losing any of his chivalrous characteristics. "He is lover, soldier, pilgrim," says Professor Peers. "Till the age of twenty-six, his principal delight is in feats of horsemanship and arms; his principal ambition, martial glory. His courage in the face of excruciating pain is amazing. Sick, he asks for *Amadis of Gaul* to read. Whole and converted, he turns naturally at first in directions suggested by such romances as this, only spiritualizing his chivalric ideals."

The author considers at some length the claim of St. Ignatius' *Spiritual Exercises* to be a mystical work, and judges them as follows:

"Rather than as 'writings' they are implements, tools, weapons, forged with an aim, for the use both of the officers and of the rank and file of the spiritual army. . . . They are part of the standing orders, as it were, of the training manual of the Society of Jesus: they have governed its organization, and contributed to its success."

Though a mystic, and one who has himself penetrated deep into the hidden life of the soul, St. Ignatius wrote rather of the earlier stages of prayer. He is, however, constantly pointing the way to the final goal, and setting before his disciples the road of self-discipline and self-surrender along which the soldier-spirit must fight its way.

The other mystics, whose lives and writings Professor Peers examines, are less known to English readers. Luis de Granada rose from humble beginnings, his widowed mother being laundress to a Dominican convent. The boy, who was unusually precocious, was chosen by the convent for a scholarship at the College of St. Gregory, Valladolid. Luis became a notable scholar and preacher. His reputation for sanctity grew so great that some of his followers considered him infallible. This greatly troubled Fray Luis, who refuted the accusation of infallibility in a sermon with the text: "Who is weak, and I am not weak?"

Up to the end of a long life of eighty years, he was busy with his work of exhortation and writing. Most of his books were written when he was between the ages of sixty and eighty. The collected edition comprises fourteen large volumes. Professor Peers selects for special notice *The Book of Prayer and Meditation* (afterwards republished as *The Sinners' Guide*), *Introduction to the Symbol of the Faith*, and several others, all famous in their day.

The third mystic in Professor Peers' Studies, Francisco de Osuna, is the author of *The Third Spiritual Alphabet*, a book which exercised great influence on St. Teresa. She was a girl of twenty when a pious relative put it into her hands, and from it she learned the practice of mental prayer. The very copy she used is preserved as a relic by the nuns of Avila.

Little is known of the life of Francisco. He entered the Franciscan Order at a very early age, and seems to have devoted most of his life to writing treatises on the spiritual life. He published volumes suited to Christians at all stages of their development. His mysticism is uncompromising, his exhortations are trumpet-calls to effort and adventure.

"Withdraw from all other love, be it good or bad," he cries, "and as one that swims, cleave a path till thou come to God."

In a peaceful little court which fronts the façade of the

University of Salamanca, stands the statue of yet another Spanish mystic, Luis de León. "A tall grave figure, the eyes cast down, the right hand lowered in deprecation, the left holding a book."

Here is a man, the chief desire of whose life was for peace, who yet found himself ever in the midst of strife. Luis, friar of the Augustinian Order, was Professor of Theology at Salamanca. In those days it was not possible for a theologian who spoke his mind to avoid making enemies. Fray Luis incurred the displeasure of the Inquisition, and was thrown into prison. The story of his return to the university is famous. Entering his lecture-room after four years' absence, he stood up quietly before his audience and began: "As we were saying yesterday——"

Luis de León is not merely the theologian and university lecturer. As Professor Peers shows, he excels in the writing of both prose and verse, and on occasions treats of the most unlikely topics. Side by side with such mystical works as *The Names of Christ* and *The Exposition of the Book of Job*, he produced a volume of homely and charming counsel, entitled *The Perfect Wife*. Here he describes the "virtuous woman," and displays a knowledge of womankind very surprising in a professor who was also a friar. It was contemplation of Nature, however, that moved Luis de León to write most movingly of the beauties of the spiritual life.

"Christ dwells in the fields!" he exclaims. Music, too, awakens in him memories of his divine home, to which he believes himself to be returning. The notes which recur most frequently in his mysticism are those of *beauty, harmony, and peace*.

The last of the mystics mentioned in this volume is Juan de los Angeles, the Franciscan. He is the author of *The Triumphs of the Love of God*, *The Spiritual and Amorous Strife between God and the Soul*, and many other mystical works. He is interesting as having approached the problem of the mystical consciousness from the point of view of the psychologist. With great delicacy of perception, he describes supernormal states, explains the place of passivity in religious experience, notes the aridities that will afflict the questing soul, and paints a glowing picture of the delights that mark the end of the pilgrimage.

In quite a modern spirit he discusses the physical phenomena that often accompany mystical experience, helping his readers to disentangle the essential from the non-essential. There were many miracle-mongers and impostors in sixteenth-century Spain. Very valuable was the counsel that enabled devout persons to tell the false from the true.

And now? What of mysticism in Spain to-day? Grass grows between the stones in the squares of Salamanca, and the halls where Luis de León preached are almost deserted. Monasteries and convents where the great mystics wrote and prayed have many of them fallen into ruins. So, too, the spiritual life of an ardent nation would seem to have suffered decay. A Spaniard, himself a mystic, told me that there was little or no mysticism in contemporary Spain.

What better hope could one express for this admirable work of Professor Peers than that it should be translated into Spanish and, by the inspiration of its learning and enthusiasm, call into life the dormant spirituality of a race that still cherishes the memory of St. Teresa and St. John of the Cross.

AELFRIDA TILLYARD.

PRAYER: A STUDY IN THE HISTORY AND PSYCHOLOGY OF RELIGION.* By Friedrich Heiler. 5th edition. Munich. 1923.

A renewed interest has no doubt been aroused in the works of Professor Heiler since he delivered his lectures at the Universities of Cambridge, Oxford, and London, and at Canterbury. He was first known to the world of European scholarship by his important work, *Der Katholizismus*, but the present monograph on Prayer (*Das Gebet*) will enhance his reputation as a theologian. It is not merely a monograph, but a treatise on comparative religion. The writer has treated his subject with scientific thoroughness and comprehensiveness. One is reminded of Bacon's classification of books in his essay on Studies: "Some books are to be tasted, others to be swallowed, and some few to be chewed and digested; that is, some books are to be read only in parts; others to be read but not curiously; and some few to be read wholly, and with diligence and attention." We would warn those who are disposed to read a book of this kind that they will need a strong intellectual digestion, but if they persevere in their efforts to assimilate its contents, they will find solid food both for thought and devotion. In spite of its massive erudition, the book concerns itself less with abstract theories than with practical religion.

After a general introduction to the subject, Professor Heiler passes in review the principal types of prayer, from the primitive forms up to the advanced forms of individual and social prayer.

In primitive religion the kernel of all prayer is petition, and its aim the intensification of the will to live. Prayer was

* *Das Gebet: eine religionsgeschichtliche und religionspsychologische Untersuchung.*

originally quite independent of sacrifice, but the thought soon arose in men's minds that the gods could be persuaded by presents. The "high gods," however, do not receive any sacrifices. The principle of mutual benefit is frankly asserted: "Here is the sacrifice, where are thy gifts?"

The primitive conception of God is that of a supersensual power, but the Divine presence is locally limited. The mutability of God is an essential presupposition. As He has a free will, He can grant or refuse the requests of men.

It will be convenient to put together in one group the historical religions of the ancient world, those of the Greeks, Romans, Jews and Persians. The attitude of the Greeks towards their gods bore a twofold aspect. On the one hand, the feeling of dependence prompted them to invoke the Divine assistance on all occasions; on the other hand, their relation to the gods was never that of slavish submission, but rather of free and manly friendship. Little need be said about Roman religion, as it was chiefly concerned with state ritual and official ceremonies.

In Mazdeism and post-exilic Judaism, religions of the law, prayer is a prescribed duty or a work of merit. The Jews were obliged to recite the *Shema* and, later on, the *Shemone Esre*; the Parsis had their three formulas of prayer, which they had to offer to Ahura Mazda. While this legal and meritorious prayer can often degenerate into mechanical formalism, there is no doubt that the average believer does need set forms and regular habits of prayer.

There are two chief types of personal piety in the Christian Church: mysticism and prophetic religion.

Mysticism is neither of Christian origin nor a speciality of Christianity, but rather the highest religious creation, which has been perfected in non-Christian religions. Prayer, in mysticism, has been defined by Origen, Augustine, and John of Damascus, as the ascent of the mind or soul to God, and this has become the normal definition of Catholic theology. For the mystic the petition for earthly blessings is, as Augustine says, *carnaliter orare*, but the man who is reborn in the spirit ought only *spiritualiter orare*. All mystic prayer is permeated with the certainty of the immediate presence of God, who is conceived as undifferentiated unity. The mystic experience may be sacramental, sexual, or quietistic. One can even speak of a mysticism of the tabernacle. "As God dwells in heaven, so the tabernacle has become his dwelling here on earth." The second kind speaks the language of extravagant affection, while the third aims at the *sancta indifferentia*, absolute resignation to the Divine will. Mystical prayer, in its classic expression,

is the sublimest form of all prayer, because it is free from egoism, eudæmonism, and the anthropomorphism of primitive prayer.

The essence of prophetic prayer is the discharge of emotion. Prayer for temporal things is justified by confidence in God, which is tempered by a real subordination to the will of God. The God of the prophetic experience is Will and Personality. As both Luther and Calvin believed, the Divine presence is not locally limited. Prayer produces a definite, almost magical effect by an alteration (*Umstimmung*) of the Divine will.

The mystical and prophetic elements in religion are represented by the Catholic Church and the Evangelical congregations. Although deeper religious life radiates from the Catholic mass, yet the ideal of Divine service is on the side of Evangelical Christendom. The chief defects of Evangelicalism, as pointed out by the Strassburg divine Fernand Ménégoz, are its radical truthfulness, and its excessive emphasis on the personality of the individual preacher.

We have postponed to this point the consideration of the philosophic ideal of prayer, which appears to be, in the main, negative and critical. Kant declared that "it is an absurd and presumptuous fancy to attempt by our importunity to divert God from his plans for the world." Like the mystics, the philosophers reject prayer for material goods but retain it for moral values: they are also disposed to adopt an attitude of fatalistic resignation.

The immutability of God belongs to the elements of philosophic metaphysics. God cannot alter the laws of Nature or His purpose for the world. This seems to be a false antithesis between matter and spirit. If God cannot control matter, would He be able to direct the human will?

It is true that Comte and Spinoza recommend prayer, but they abolish its traditional character. Prayer possesses only a subjective, psychological meaning, and is transformed into pious reflection, or mere self-suggestion.

However, Kant's ideal of a "religion within the limits of pure reason" is severely criticized by Auguste Sabatier. "Natural religion is no real religion, but only a philosophy. The three dogmas, the existence of God, immortality, and the obligation of duty, are only a deposit at the bottom of the crucible, in which all positive religions are dissolved. It is an artificial creation, and shows hardly any trace of the special features of religion."

We must now sum up the main results of this enquiry. The principal characteristics of prayer are (a) the belief in Divine Personality; (b) the belief in God's immediate presence; (c) the

living intercourse with God; and (d) the reflection of an earthly social relation. Prayer is therefore defined by Professor Heiler as a "living intercourse of the believer with God conceived as personal and experienced as present, an intercourse which reflects the forms of human social relations." We may be thankful for Professor Heiler's comprehensive and illuminating exposition of the subject. Whether we are simple believers or learned scholars, we are bound to agree with the confession of St. Chrysostom: "There is nothing more powerful than or equal to prayer."

L. PATTERSON.

NOTICES

RETREATS, THEIR VALUE, METHOD, AND ORGANIZATION. Edited by R. Schofield, B.A. With Prefaces by the Rt. Rev. J. A. Kempthorne, D.D., and the Rt. Rev. F. J. Chavasse, D.D. Paper cover, 2s. 6d. Cloth boards, 3s. 6d.

There never was a time in which there was so much coming and going, or when life was so full of distractions. Never, therefore, was there more need to "come apart and rest awhile"; to employ, that is to say, the group method of withdrawal for refreshment and strengthening by quiet communion with Reality—in a word, for the use of "Retreats." That this need is increasingly recognized is one of the most hopeful signs at this moment; and we cannot be surprised that many should be looking for direction as to how it is best to be met.

The issue of this book is most opportune. In it no less than ten writers give us advice as the result of experiences gathered within our Communion and beyond it. There are valuable counsels on all manner of topics—the choosing of places and the framing of programmes; the desirability or undesirability of continuous silence; the length of addresses and the arrangement of interviews; not omitting such mundane matters as meals, and beds, and the cleaning of boots.

Possibly some more assistance might have been offered to conductors who are perplexed as to the kind of instructions that are required in view of the special spiritual conditions and intellectual demands of to-day. There are still those who would advise that an almost exclusive emphasis should be laid upon the relations between God and the individual, as these are made the starting-point, and, indeed, the foundation, of the Ignatian Exercises and the Westminster Catechism. But happily there is a very general agreement that our Retreats, like those in Galilee and before Pentecost, must be preparatory for service—service to our Lord, and to the Church as His chosen instrument in the extension of the Kingdom.

We can only repeat that this book is timely and admirable. The S.P.C.K. has done well to publish it, and the price is such as should help to ensure for it a wide circulation.

A. W. ROBINSON.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND HISTORY. By H. Belloc. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 4s.

Mr. Belloc here deals in his well-known clear style with the one argument, that history refutes Catholicism. Both branches of the argument break down—the minor one, that the Church has propagated or rests upon falsehoods, and the major, that the Church is man-made and not divine. He concludes: "If it [Roman Catholicism] is not what it claims to be, then all is void." Like many other clever books, this is far less persuasive than the author means it to be. One example will suffice. Mr. Belloc means by the Catholic Church that society which accepts "not only the supremacy of that see [of Rome] but also the infallibility of its occupant when, as shepherd and teacher of all Christians, and speaking in that capacity, he defines a matter in faith or morals" (p. 13). On p. 65 he refers to Spiritualism as follows: "The infallible authority cannot abdicate in such a crux without denying its own claim. There is no reconciliation of such a contradiction; it is Hell or Heaven. It must define and it does define; and we know on which side its definition lies. Necromancy—or Spiritualism as its modern name goes—is of Hell." Scientific investigators of these obscure phenomena would certainly reply that there are alternatives other than those mentioned. If Mr. Belloc is right, infallibility extends to pronouncements on Spiritualism, and no one can adopt certain scientific hypotheses without rebellion against the Church.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

THE THREE TRADITIONS IN THE GOSPELS. By W. Lockton, B.D. Longmans. 7s. 6d.

Mr. Lockton has given us a learned, clear, and reverent study of several incidents in the Gospel narrative. He has brought to his task, which is clearly a labour of love, a close knowledge of the text of the Septuagint and of Jewish non-canonical writings. He has much to say that is suggestive, even if he is sometimes fanciful. But the whole book is dominated by the desire to establish a particular theory about the origin of the Gospels which has often perverted the writer's judgment. In opposition to current views based on the priority of Mark, he maintains that the four Gospels can be shown to go back to the different lines of tradition, derived from the three Apostles, Peter, James, and John. The main outline of Luke is based on the Petrine tradition, though Luke also includes large blocks of the tradition of James. Mark is later in time than Luke, and has largely conflated the Petrine tradition with the other two. The Fourth Gospel is based on a single tradition, that of John. Mr. Lockton throughout clearly regards Luke as a superior authority to Mark, as preserving the more original form of apostolic tradition. We may add that this theory is in no sense made to serve the ends of orthodoxy. At several points it leads to results that conflict with traditional opinions. The full evidence for such a theory can only be estimated by a detailed examination of the evidence, for which there is no space here. We still remain unconvinced, in spite of Mr. Lockton's erudition. We can only bring forward three points out of many at which he seems to us to fail in his arguments. First, there is, no doubt, a certain number

of passages in which it is possible in the abstract to explain the text of Mark as a modification of that of Luke, but there are more on the other side. The whole picture of our Lord and of the Apostles in Mark is clearly more primitive than that in Luke. This completely outweighs first impressions derived from a few selected passages. Secondly, Mr. Lockton's theory compels him to treat the two miracles in Mark, which represent Christ as using physical means, as later additions. It is far more reasonable to regard them as quite naïve and primitive narratives, omitted by Luke because the whole method of healing seemed derogatory to the Lord. So, too, his treatment of the "young man who fled naked" ignores the natural simplicity of the story. Thirdly, he answers far too easily that because a story is concerned with an apostle, and contains vivid touches, it must come direct from the apostle. Other explanations are at least possible. While, however, we are unable to accept his hypothesis, we recognize that he often calls attention to points that in the past have not attracted sufficient notice. Luke contains many primitive details. But we believe that Canon Streeter's "Proto-Luke" theory is the best explanation of them. Mark and John do at times use similar language. But we are reluctant to believe that any form of John is prior to Mark. In short, if this book stimulates discussion, it will fulfil its purpose. It would be a good exercise for a student of the Gospels to go through it with his Greek Testament, and if he disagrees with many passages in it, be ready to give a reason for his disagreement.

E. J. BICKNELL.

SALLUSTIUS CONCERNING THE GODS AND THE UNIVERSE. Edited, with Prolegomena and Translation, by A. D. Nock. Cambridge University Press. 12s. 6d.

This treatise has a special interest for students of comparative religions as being one of the very few formal statements of belief ever issued by a pagan theologian. The very idea of a dogmatic creed was strange to ancient religion, which was always a system of right performance of ritual rather than of right belief. This document seems to have been intended as a brief reasoned statement in the service of that revival of a purified paganism associated with the name of the Emperor Julian. Its author is an adherent of Neoplatonism in the form given to it by Iamblichos, and is reasonably supposed to have been the friend, perhaps teacher, who is mentioned several times in the Emperor's letters. It was, however, never published, or, at any rate, had only a small circulation, and is never alluded to in contemporary literature. Mr. Nock supplies us with an introduction, text and translation in very convenient compass, and makes the Greek text very much more accessible than it has hitherto been. The introduction is supplementary to the essay by Professor Murray in *Five Stages of Greek Religion*, and in no way takes its place; it is, perhaps, disappointing in its restraint and confinement to the discussion of comparatively small points. Nothing but praise, however, can be given to the following chapter, which learnedly analyzes the work and succeeds for the most part in establishing the source of every important statement and view in Sallustius' treatise. Here, again, the aim of the author is precision and minuteness; presumably he felt it would be out of place to go into the

many wider questions that at once suggest themselves to every reader of the treatise. We may point to the treatment of myths, which may be compared with Origen's handling of difficult stories in the O.T. It grapples with the problem of evil, and asserts the indestructibility of the universe, an important point in a world where Christians still expected its imminent dissolution. It is in advance of its period in minimizing the importance of astrology, behind it in recommending sacrifice of animals, though it gives an interesting reason for this. It concludes with one of those sturdy proclamations that to the good man his virtue is its own reward, which are so common in antiquity and so strange to us—the mood of *Invictus* is our nearest modern equivalent.

H. B. HILLIS.

FAITH, FANCIES AND FETICH; OR, YORUBA PAGANISM. By Stephen S. Farrow, B.D., Ph.D. S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d.

A regional study of the customs and beliefs of primitive tribes from the pen of a missionary "in residence" is always read with eagerness by anthropologists ever alert for new material, and there are few countries on which missionary writings do not rank among the most valuable authorities. Thus Dr. Codrington in Melanesia, Canon John Roscoe among the Bantu, and Dr. Fox in the Pacific, to mention but three honoured names at random, have supplied us with veritable mines of information concerning native ways of thinking and primitive custom. Dr. Farrow in the volume before us displays an intimate acquaintance with the language of the Yoruba on the West Coast of Africa, and a sympathetic understanding of his people, and with these qualifications it is disappointing that he has not given us more help in the scientific investigation of an important region.

That we have here a rich field of research for a trained anthropologist is abundantly clear both from the work of A. B. Ellis, R. E. Dennett, A. J. N. Tremearne, and R. H. Nassau in the past, and from the four volumes that Mr. P. A. Talbot, Resident in Nigeria, has just published on the peoples of Southern Nigeria. It might be expected, therefore, that Dr. Farrow would have undertaken a more thorough investigation of the religious beliefs and practices of the tribes of the Yoruba country, especially in view of the fact that his book was written as a thesis for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the University of Edinburgh. That it constitutes an interesting summary of West African "Faith, Fancies and Fetich," and an excellent apologetic for missionary activity, cannot be denied, but as a contribution to the scientific study of the history of religion it is lacking both in a detailed treatment of the material and in its analysis. Thus the institution of totemism cannot be adequately dealt with in this area in one page, and something more than a passing reference to "brides of the serpent" is required in view of the evidence on the serpent cult in this connection in the Lower Congo and elsewhere. Again, Herbert Spencer's "dream theory" cannot be regarded to-day as the last word on the complex problem of the origin of the soul, as Dr. Farrow seems to imagine (p. 131). In Chapter VII., quaintly entitled "The Devil," a malevolent spirit, *Eshu*, is described and his images are illustrated. A glance at these figures reveals to the anthropologist that originally this being was associated with the cult of the Mother Goddess, a conclusion

supported by the adornment of the wooden images with strings of cowries (p. 86). It would be interesting to know how and when this metamorphosis occurred. On p. 152 some of the crucial problems arising out of the material are enumerated, but dismissed with the words, "we cannot attempt here to answer any one of these questions."

Dr. Farrow is clearly first and foremost a missionary, and he is at his best when he justifies the propagation of Christianity among native races. As Dr. Marett says in his Foreword, "In every inquiry we must start from certain presuppositions, which in a sense are prejudices," and the author adopts the standpoint of the Christian missionary. It is a pity, however, that he bases his theological position on what seems to be something very like an interpretation of the opening chapters of Genesis as a literal record of fact. Thus he appears to regard man as beginning in a state of civilization (cf. p. 158), and as a result he constantly employs the term "degradation" in an ethical as opposed to a cultural sense. This is misleading in an anthropological treatise, especially when it is applied to such a practice as human sacrifice (p. 98), since, however revolting the custom may be, it is not from the scientific standpoint an indication of degeneration. A very strong case can be made for regarding the belief in a Supreme Being as a psychological tendency, a revelation or an "awareness," rather than a stage in an evolutionary system, and Dr. Farrow's support of this contention would have been strengthened if he had kept strictly to scientific language and method.

E. O. JAMES.